

JPRS-UKO-87-014

13 AUGUST 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report—

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 7, MAY 1987

13 AUGUST 1987

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

SOVIET UNION

KOMMUNIST

No 7, May 1987

[Translation of the Russian-language theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow 18 times per year.]

CONTENTS

For a Better World. A Word to the American Reader (M. Gorbachev).....	1
ACCELERATION AND RESTRUCTURING: THEORY AND PRACTICE	
The Concept of Acceleration -- Political and Economic Aspects (S. Sitaryan).....	13
Economic Theory and Practice of Restructuring: A. Rummyantsev and I. Lukinov Answer Questions from KOMMUNIST.....	26
New Way of Thinking and Working	
Combining Regional, Sectorial and Individual Interests (V. Mesyats).....	37
In My Opinion.... Letters to the Editors	
Party Work and Education (V. Shirshov).....	50
Scientific Research Institute or Design Bureau? (Yu. Belyayev).....	52
The Artist and Industry (I. Seredyuk).....	54

DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES

Discussion of the USSR Draft Law on the State Enterprise (Association)

Self-Government and Centralism (A. Bulyanda).....	56
Perfecting the Economic Competition (P. Grechishnikov).....	60
To Reflect Planning Principles More Fully (V. Kulkov).....	64
Excerpts from Letters.....	67

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Leninism, Revolution, Contemporaneity.....	70
Lenin. Essay on the Interdependence of His Ideas (Gyorgy Lukacs).....	82

EVERYTHING WITHIN MAN--EVERYTHING FOR MAN

Man--Technology--Nature. Roundtable of the Journals KOMMUNIST and NOWE DROGI.....	100
Genetics, Society, Personality (D. Belyayev).....	115

Man of the New World: Concerns, Ideals, Values

The Course of Destiny: An Essay on Academician N.P. Bekhtereva (Ye. Manucharova).....	124
--	-----

CONTEMPORARY WORLD: TRENDS AND CONTRADICTIONS

U.S. 'Neoglobalism' and Latin America (V. Bushuyev).....	132
---	-----

FEEDBACK: FROM THE READER TO THE JOURNAL

Profile of a Reader (O. Kuprin).....	145
---	-----

BOOK REVIEWS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY. INFORMATION

Priceless Lines (V. Mosolov).....	161
Short Book Reviews.....	165

Bookshelf.....	167
In the Course of Restructuring.....	169
Chronicle: Meetings With the Editors.....	173

PUBLICATION DATA

English title	: KOMMUNIST, No 7 May 1987
Russian title	: KOMMUNIST
Author(s)	:
Editor(s)	: I.T. Frolov (editor in chief), E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, N.B. Bikkenin, K.N. Brutents R.K. Vid, V.I. Kadulin, S.V. Kolesnikov, O.R. Iatsis, Yu. L. Molchanov, Ye.Z. Razumov V.F. Rubtsov, N.N. Sibiryakov, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev
Publishing House	: Izdatelstvo "PRAVDA"
Place of Publication	: Moscow
Date of Publication	: April 1987
Signed to press	: 20 April 1987
Copies	: 1,110,000
COPYRIGHT	: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

FOR A BETTER WORLD. A WORD TO THE AMERICAN READER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 3-12

[Preface by M.S. Gorbachev to his book "For a Better World"]

[Text] The American publishing firm of Richardson and Stairman have published the third collection of speeches and statements by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

The collection, entitled "For a Better World", includes the (January-December 1986) works by M.S. Gorbachev, in particular his press conference in Reykjavik, the 14 and 22 October 1986 addresses on Soviet television, the CPSU Central Committee political report to the 27th CPSU Congress, his speech on Soviet television on the occasion of the continuation of nuclear tests by the United States, his speech to Togliatti automobile manufacturers and his answers to the questions of American Journalist G. Kingsbury-Smith.

At the request of the publishers, last year M.S. Gorbachev wrote a preface, "A Word to the American Reader", to the book.

Following is the preface by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee secretary.

This, dear readers, is the third collection of my speeches, published in the United States. It is in a way a continuation of the discussion which we started a year ago, centered, naturally, on the most topical problems of world politics, international security and Soviet-American relations. These problems are common to both of us and, for which reason we must consider them for the sake of peace and solve them by mutual agreement and to our mutual advantage.

The works included in this collection cover a variety of topics and areas both very specific and extremely broad, domestic and world-wide. Nonetheless, it is my profound conviction that they are linked by the single thought that one can

no longer live and think as in the past. Efforts to make the future fit the present are simply dangerous, particularly today. This applies above all to military affairs where any mistake would turn into an irreparable catastrophe.

Each individual century, as it gives birth to new ideas, also acquires a new pair of eyes. Indeed, each and every one of us looks at the world in a way different from our fathers, grandfathers and great-grandfathers. Incidentally, our children, not to speak of our grandchildren, will also find puzzling many of our present concerns. This has always been the case.

However, the 20th century is also noted for the appearance of a number of essentially new material factors, which force us to adopt a different view on national decisions in determining the fate of civilization, the correlation between the process of knowledge and the means of using the achievements of science, and time and space. It is one thing when a policy "from a position of strength" symbolizes gunpowder, and something entirely different if it contains a potential which could turn the myth of the end of the world into real hell in numbered minutes. It is one thing when a handful of workshops release smoke and an absolutely different situation if everyone is engaged in environmental pollution with such zeal that the ecological sword begins to hang over us. Whether we like it or not, life will force us to reorganize each national economy individually and the world economy as a whole.

In short, the time has come to ask ourselves and one-another a number of questions, some of which may be troubling, for not all of them are related to customary concepts which are so lightly presented as "axiomatic" or as "eternal verities." This does not demand in the least of us to deny our faith and to accept someone else's. Let everyone stand for his own convictions and pray to his own God. We need the calm summation of the collective experience of mankind and objective conclusions based on objective premises.

No one has the right to claim that he is omniscient, that he is the ultimate oracle. There is no country which could not learn something from others. We are all both teachers and students. The point is that quite frequently reality is refracted in the mind in rather peculiar forms.

On innumerable occasions strictly internal crises have triggered international and even global crises, and all too frequently internal difficulties have caused anger abroad. Even most vulgar greed can be draped in national colors and surrounded by the rhetoric of lofty words. It may never occur to us that justice, social and national justice in particular, is the base of internal democracy and a cornerstone of harmonious intergovernmental relations. This applies not to ostentatious or elitist justice but a justice which applies to one and all.

Consider the ideological and moral concept formulated at the 27th Congress of our party and the new edition of its program, which was adopted at the congress. We consider as the dialectics of contemporary development the combination of the concepts of competition between the two systems and the growing trend of interdependence among countries in the global community. Contradictions develop but so does the interdependent and largely integral world in which the confrontation between capitalism and socialism can take

place only and exclusively in the form of peaceful competition and peaceful rivalry, a world in which ensuring security is increasingly becoming not a military but a political task, and security, in reference to the USSR and the United States, can be only reciprocal and, in terms of overall international relations, only universal.

Arguments on the nature of freedom will never disappear anymore than discussions on the nature of love. Every individual and, even more so, every generation has its own dimensions and perception of these and similar categories. They are determined by many attendant and permanent circumstances, individual character features, pride, wealth and poverty. Our old saying is that the sated does not understand the hungry. The most difficult thing for the Soviet people is to agree to the fact that some people are destined to be sated and not others. Probably the Americans as well have their own saying on the fat and the thin and arguments which deny the concept of infallibility.

However, today there simply neither are nor could exist any two views on the inseparable connection between the concepts of "peace" and "life." It is only under conditions of peace that people can continue their heated debates on rights and freedoms, tastes and predilections. The course of history, the logic of development and the thirst for peace have emerged on the foreground in the hierarchy of human values and political priorities. To the overwhelming majority of people on earth peace has become a criterion of the permissible and the impermissible, of the legal and the illegal. In the nuclear age right is based not on "I want," for my power allows me to "want," but on human duty to the living and to those who will live after us. In my view, all of us must adopt this the only accurate, moral and fruitful approach to the problem of war and peace. This applies to people of all countries, nationalities, outlooks, convictions, religions and social status.

The UN proclaimed 1986 a year of peace. The Soviet Union honestly supported this decision with its actions and steps. That entire year our testing grounds remained silent. We are not testing assault systems or their elements in space. The USSR has submitted an entire set of practical suggestions aimed at major improvements in the global situation.

Virtually all of our initiatives are reflected in this book. Let me name the broadest among them:

A proposal on the gradual elimination under strict supervision of nuclear weapons was submitted on 15 January 1986;

Foundations for a comprehensive system of international security, in the military, political, economic and humanitarian areas, were formulated by the end of February;

A package of detailed and balanced suggestions related to nuclear and space armaments was put on the table at the Soviet-American talks;

Together with its Warsaw Pact allies, the USSR formulated a program for reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe;

A broad plan for ensuring peace and cooperation in their part of the world was brought to the attention of countries in the Asian-Pacific area;

Throughout the year the task of ending nuclear tests under strict international supervision remained on the agenda. For the sake of solving this problem, on four consecutive occasions the USSR extended its unilateral moratorium.

No particular cleverness or practical considerations are needed to label our initiatives as "propaganda." Nothing can be easier, particularly when one is unwilling to solve the problem in its essence. But let us ask ourselves the unprejudiced question of what are we "propagandizing?" A halt to nuclear tests, the elimination of nuclear weapons with efficient supervision in all its forms, the elimination of military bases abroad, a reduction of conventional armaments and, subsequently, total disarmament, ending the propaganda of hatred of other nations and building good neighborly relations and cooperation for the sake of life among all countries.

How can this be bad? Why is it that there are those who prefer the propaganda of violence and cruelty, a fanatical approach to weapons and reducing diplomacy to a tool of power politics, and international relations to one of armed confrontation? There are those who are trying to prove that military technology can answer the age-old question of "to be or not to be." According to the logic of the defenders of power a wedge can dislodge only another wedge. This is suicidal deceit and a malicious attempt at making a vice seem like a virtue in order to block the admission, not to say the assertion of the elementary truth that if there is to be life there must be no weapons.

It is difficult for the adult to relearn. This is true. But then what can one do if our time has its demands. The "stop" signal will flash with increasing frequency in front of nations and their leaders. No one should consider this objective need as a loss of sovereignty, prestige or national pride, even less so when they are replaced by force.

Is it moral endlessly to insult common sense, to try people's nerves and keep them in an eternal state of fear?

Is it admissible endlessly to draw on the resources of the planet, to pollute its atmosphere and water, to destroy nature and to overload the ecological system?

Is it responsible to set national egotism as a base, rejecting all restrictions and even self-restrictions, whether under the banner of consumerism or the notorious "higher interests?"

How can we make our entire common home on earth invulnerable rather than merely ensure the comfort of well-furnished housing to one or two of its luckiest inhabitants? The Soviet Union calls for jointly answering the challenge of the age. Jointly means not at the expense or to the detriment of one another. It means to try to see above all what unites us, what makes us parts of the whole, rather than what sets us on opposite poles.

It would be useful to ask ourselves where did the stereotype come from, who fabricated the postulate, that the USSR is America's enemy? When did this begin to stupefy the mind? Russia not only did not hinder but even somewhat helped your revolution. Russia's "attentive neutrality" favored the struggle waged by the North American colonies for their liberation. Yet the United States "welcomed" our October 1917 Revolution, as we know, quite differently. When the American interventionists, like many others, were forced to withdraw from Soviet soil, the rulers of the United States felt mortally "insulted," so that for 16 years they failed to recognize the statehood of the USSR.

In general, let me point out the following. In reading a book of American history, one may unwittingly asks oneself: What happened to the old, virtuous and sentimental America? What was the source of such "nonrecognition," "punishment" even through hunger, and arbitrary decision of what is "evil" and what is "good," and wishing misfortunes upon others? The most hated are those to whom one causes harm.

I have no intention whatsoever of blaming someone. Blaming is harmful even in family life and, even more so, in relations among countries. I am simply appealing for thinking without blinkers, without trite myths and lies. The reason that I mention the beginning of all this is not in the least for the purpose of hurting someone.

I am guided by other considerations. Why are Soviet-American relations almost always behind global developments? Why is it that we are not motivated by normal and sober considerations in undertaking joint constructive actions but mainly by dangerous and cruel events? Why is it that peals of thunder turn out to be more convincing than arguments dictated by common sense?

Yes, we have a socialist system and our people prefer precisely the type of social system which it gained with its revolution and defended in wars against interventionists and fascists, at the cost of tens of millions of casualties. We do not consider our order absolutely perfect. We are doing a great deal to make life better, cleaner and spiritually and materially richer. We are different. But is this a reason for enmity, for imposing our system, our way of life, and our yardstick in measuring freedom on others? Where does this arrogant claim to "perfection" come from? It is dangerous, very dangerous, one must say.

Once again today we have a common enemy, a more terrible enemy than German Nazism and Japanese militarism in World War II, when our countries fought side-by-side. Its name is nuclear war. In the struggle against it the USSR and the United States must be on the same side, unconditionally. No one has to sacrifice his holy places, not to mention his interests, in an alliance against the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Nuclear weapons are immoral and inhuman in their essence. Their existence has no justification in religion, dogma or life itself. What could nuclear power prove? Only one thing: the stupidity and imperfection of man and how strong atavism within him remains. However, if the worst were to happen, there would be no one around to prove it, for after a war there would be neither shepherds nor flocks, neither wooden Russian homes nor New York skyscrapers, neither Kremlin nor White House, neither man nor beast. There would be no life!

Soviet society is ready to engage in peaceful competition with the capitalist system. We do not fear this. Nothing in our philosophy prevents even the most radical agreements on disarmament, including the total demilitarization of the planet under international control. You may describe this as historical optimism or any other way you like, but it is peace that is our main ally and assistant in all constructive initiatives. I admit this most loudly, without reservations. The arms race and military confrontation and display of muscle is not our choice or policy. For your information, let me point out that immediately after the revolution we did not even have an army and had no intention of creating one. The army appeared only when the interventionists stepped on our soil.

How to begin cleansing the earth from the militaristic foulness? In our view, it would be most practical to begin from the beginning, by putting an end to nuclear tests. This should be followed by a reduction in military arsenals and, at the same time, strengthening confidence among countries and converting to civilized relations. All of this can be achieved but only if it is understood that the age of nuclear weapons demands radically different approaches to the problem of war. Nuclear power creates and maintains the psychological hope of achieving global domination and the hope that other countries would obey the laws of those who wield the nuclear sword. Naturally, this is an illusion, for nuclear war inevitably destroys "domination" and, even more so, those who lay a claim to domination. This too must be understood. Politics must be channeled into a direction entirely different from the one it is following today, persistently, patiently and purposefully.

In order for the people not to lose control, the USSR is tirelessly calling on the governments to put a limit to the militarization of science, to stop developing new military technologies and, as a first step, to end nuclear tests. In August 1985 the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Our testing grounds were silent despite the fact that the Western powers kept exploding one charge after another.

In deciding on the moratorium we did not exclude the possibility that Washington would begin to maneuver, citing the "complexity of verification," and "lack of trust" and, once such reasons would exhaust their propaganda value, would totally drop all justifications and stipulations. It would say that this was necessary in the interest of national security and that would be all! This was a risk which existed from the very beginning. Nonetheless, we were hoping that common sense would prevail. For a moratorium to become reciprocal and, subsequently, universal, neither material outlays nor any kind of exceptional efforts are needed. All that was needed was political will and responsibility to the present and the future of mankind. Only a half-step separates an end to tests from the formulation of an agreement, for a document would merely codify the actual situation.

Therefore, what is being tested in Nevada is not only and not even exclusively weapons or latest technological ideas. It is above all the policy of the state which is being tested here, establishing the extent to which statements rejecting nuclear wars and promising a nuclear-free peace, a test of historical maturity, are meant. No need to dissemble: the continuation of

nuclear tests means that efforts are being made to create post-nuclear weapons. This is obvious.

In this context, it would be useful to recall something from the recent and not so recent past. How did the present vicious circle of the arms race appear? It was the United States which hammered out, starting with 1945, and introduced in international politics nuclear weapons, strategic aviation, nuclear submarines, missiles with multiple warheads, the neutron bomb and more than 25 of the most terrible types of weapons and armaments. The Soviet Union was forced to catch up with the United States, to close the gap and to postpone the solution of many vital problems.

However, the United States itself had to pay a high price for this militaristic "success." The price was stiff from the economic viewpoint: according to official data, total U.S. military expenditures from 1946 to 1986 amount to nearly \$3.4 trillion. Obviously, such funds could have been spent more usefully on the American people. The cost was high, extremely high also from the military-political viewpoint, from the viewpoint of the true security of the country. The payment for risk and fear increased with each new system of armaments added to the American arsenals. As a result, the United States stopped being invulnerable and today the oceans no longer play the role of its "guardian angels." By creating this situation, American militarism caused the greatest harm to the interests of the American people as well.

This situation will not change unless an end is put to it. Action will trigger counteraction. If the USSR were to take a first step, you would immediately try to catch up. If the Americans start a new round, we will find our own antidote. But for how long? For how long do we have to keep tightening the rope before common sense could take over, before the irreparable has occurred? The situation today is such that the Soviet Union has an extensive list of responses. Imitation--which suited the United States well--has come to an end. This is both better and worse. It is better because it costs us less. It is worse because its incompatibility with the development of technology will make control over armaments even more difficult or else make the problem technically insoluble.

Now as to the main question: What are we arguing about? Why the hostility, what do we have to divide? We are not competing on the world market. Geographically, our interests do not conflict. We have no Soviet bases near your borders. We have a number of ideological and political differences. However, this should not be grounds for mutual destruction. Why buck it?

I regularly read American newspapers and journals, listen to the radio and obtain extensive information. I keep asking myself, what is the reason for such hostility, such hatred of us, what dictates it, what motivates it? Could it be that chauvirism--this refuge of ignorance--has become mass ideology? When talking to Americans, and I have had many conversations with them, usually one hears nothing of the sort. Neither hatred nor military blood-thirstiness. One feels a desire for cooperation, peace and good neighborly relations. What is happening? Someone appears to need the existence of hostility between us. But who?

It is said that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted. If the United States is truly convinced of this, let us look jointly as to why this is so. What are the reasons, what are the grounds for such mistrust? Let us calmly, without unnecessary polemics and emotions which suppress the voice of reason, recall the history of our countries and our relations and clarify misunderstandings and puzzlements, in as much as they exist. Let us also see if we are not turning a fly into an elephant. If such is the case, something which, from our viewpoint, is precisely the case, once again, who needs this and why? What could and should be done to put an end to such faulty practices?

Let me say without any reservations that in the Soviet Union as well the question of trust is asked by many people. It is being said openly by many that one cannot, one should not trust the United States, a view which is supported by facts. We were not recognized for 16 years and it was we and not you who were surrounded by lethal bases. We were not the first to develop new means of warfare. Specific deadlines for a preventive nuclear attack were set for us, and our country was divided on the map into occupation zone. The nature of a governmental system was even preset. NSC (National Security Council) documents on this matter have been declassified and can be consulted. We were subjected to various types of insults and were "punished." It was proposed that we be sent to the dump of history, and so on, and so forth. I shall not yield to the temptation of continuing the list which feeds our most profound mistrust. I occasionally ask myself, what would happen if all of this was our doing rather than that of the United States? How would you, dear Americans, feel? How would you react?

The Soviet leadership proceeds from the fact that intransigence in foreign policy is unpromising, although some U.S. circles rely on it, and that no economic, ideological or military confrontation, is necessary. Occasionally, however, a dead-end situation does appear and one asks oneself: What is one to do as one keeps hearing this standard, unfortunate and endless "no?"

My frankness may amaze or puzzle some. It may seem that nothing has happened to invite an open discussion. The disappointment with developments after the Geneva summit was obvious. A rapprochement in words as a result of the Geneva meeting was accompanied by increased differences in actions and views. So far no new agreements have been reached and old agreements are being hurriedly voided. The U.S. withdrawal from Salt 1 and Salt 2 was proclaimed. The public is being prepared for the abrogation of the ABM Treaty of indefinite duration. The "Star Wars" program is being accelerated. The ASAT antisatellite system is being developed. According to some data, the United States is testing in Nevada third-generation and essentially new combat systems based on the energy released by nuclear explosions. According to some quite authoritative statements, the United States is preparing a full set of instruments for full-scale real nuclear war.

All in all, there are more than sufficient reasons for disappointment as well as for considerations such as, for example, what is the purpose of the American political glossary: to impart thoughts or to conceal them? Equally worrisome is the unwillingness of Western politicians to look the facts in the face and their attempts to draw the attention of the peoples away from such facts through various tricks, rhetoric and demagoguery. A phraseology of peace

does not prevent in the least the preaching of violence and the praising of nuclear weapons as the very foundations of the "strategy of containment." It is being said that all of this is for domestic consumption. I shall not undertake to judge the morality of such "consumption." However, it is time to see that today the entire world is involved in a discussion about life and death and that a "consumption" morality may have different interpretations.

The explosion of even the weakest charge would triple that of Chernobyl in terms of amount of radiation. The use of even a very small part of nuclear weapons, more than 50,000 pieces of which have been stockpiled, would be catastrophic. I frequently think of the cruel truth of the ancients, that it is possible to deprive man of everything but life. Those who make a first strike will destroy themselves. They would perish even without retribution, from the explosion of their own warheads. We thank physicians—American and Soviet—for having made this truth public. We thank scientists—Soviet and American—for the fact that, using mathematical models, they have computed what a nuclear war would be like. The word now belongs to the politicians.

This word was said by the Soviet Union during my meeting with U.S. President Reagan in Reykjavik, on 11-12 October 1986. Unfortunately, it was not our fault that it did not become a joint word. No change occurred in world history, although it was possible and closer than ever. A unique historical opportunity may have been lost. Alas, the American side displayed no new way of thinking.

We took to Reykjavik an entire package of major suggestions, the adoption of which would have allowed the start a dynamic movement toward a nuclear-free world. What did the USSR suggest to the United States?

1. This 5-year period (through 1991) to reduce strategic offensive armaments by both sides by 50 percent. In the next 5 years, by the end of 1996, to reduce the remaining armaments by 50 percent.
2. To eliminate entirely Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe. Unlike our previous proposals, we did not insist on including or reckoning with the substantial British and French nuclear potentials.
3. To establish triple control—through national means, international methods and on-site verification—over the process of eliminating nuclear weapons and the strict observance of agreements by both sides.
4. We proposed that the USSR and the United States assume the obligation to abstain from exercising the right to abrogate the open-end ABM Treaty for a period of 10 years and strictly to observe all of its stipulations, not to test space elements of antimissile defense in outer space and to limit themselves with laboratory research and testing.
5. To initiate immediate talks on imposing a total ban on nuclear tests.

We proposed the broadest possible compromises which, if accepted, would set Soviet-American relations on firm foundations. However, compromises have their limits. While disarming on earth one must not meanwhile arm in space.

If the purpose of SDI, as the American side has repeatedly stated, is to neutralize nuclear weapons, the following question arises: What would there be to neutralize if nuclear warheads and carriers are to be destroyed under triple control? No convincing answer to this question was given. What went into motion was the SDI mania, the postulate that controlling space means controlling the earth. In that case, naturally, we could not agree to excluding the ABM Treaty from agreements on nuclear disarmament. Nor did we have the right to do so: the Soviet people would never agree to this.

Therefore, SDI--a program for achieving military superiority through the militarization of space--frustrated the real agreements. Again and again we saw that SDI is not defensive. It is an effort to replace or add even more destructive and treacherous nuclear weapons. It is a new technological cover for the old familiar claim to world leadership and hegemonism.

SDI is advertised almost as an "insurance policy" for the American people. Actually, SDI appropriations are appropriations for the universal burial of mankind. This may sound harsh but truth is not always pleasant.

Militarily, SDI does not frighten us. The USSR can develop an anti-SDI program, asymmetric and less expensive than that of the United States. We could implement it faster than the American "Star Wars" program. However, we are unwilling to do so. SDI and anti-SDI means an endless arms race which could not be kept under control.

What to do? The troglodyte "experts" in international affairs, who look at everything through the lens of anti-Sovietism, are ready to start the fireworks, to celebrate the failure to reach agreement in Reykjavik. They bet on failure and, naturally, they present Reykjavik as a "failure."

I categorically reject such interpretation which turns the facts upside-down. Reykjavik was a major and important event. It was a useful meeting in many respects. A reassessment of concepts took place. The discussion of problems was raised to a qualitatively new level. It was established that all material prerequisites for building a strong peace, worthy of man, exist, and that one could undertake the elimination of the most important weaponry systems.

Nonetheless, the obstinate adherence of the American administration to its ideas shed a new light on declarations and statements that the United States no longer aspires to superiority, the recognition that there would be no winner in a war, that sensible compromises should not be ignored, and so on. It was verified that the United States was still inspired by the dream of superiority, nurturing the hope of victory in a "star" and ground war that what it meant by compromise was essentially concessions to be made by others. This was an absolute polarity between words and actions.

The world should and must become different if civilization is to go on. The nations are tired of words. They demand action, constructive action, action which would take equally into consideration the legitimate interests of one and all. This is the purpose of Soviet policy, a policy of peace and disarmament. We are in favor of continuing the Geneva and Reykjavik dialogues, in Washington, Moscow, or anywhere else.

The world is at a crossroads. Fighting is strictly forbidden. The USSR and the United States, all states and nations, face the need, while preserving their identities, to behave cautiously and correctly in the international arena and to live in a civilized fashion. There is still time to choose the road to life. Time, however, is a nonrecoverable resource and is becoming increasingly shorter. It is shrinking visibly and must not be lost. Politics must be speeded up so that, finally, science may catch up and, if possible, outstrip the technological pace of the arms race.

Children must not play with matches in order not to burn down the house and themselves. Today nuclear weapons must be taken away from the adults so that they may not burn down their common home--the earth--and destroy mankind.

Priority is given to the task of developing a new style of political thinking and, probably, new international law. It must be a thinking distinguished by respect for the people and nations with different ideologies, and different social beliefs, an international law purged from double standards and categorically outlawing aggressive wars or any other forms of international violence. We must jointly find ways of spreading good to all countries on earth in a differently structured community.

I am referring to the developing countries inhabited by more than 2 billion people. This is a huge zone of poverty whose income is lower by a factor of 11 compared to the former colonial powers. This gap is widening. This is an extremely grave problem the solution of which will require the constructive interaction among peoples and countries on a global scale.

In olden times corporals warned young privates that once a year a weapon will discharge by itself. Today, when a great deal depends on computers, generals and politicians are claiming the opposite. Should we wait for chance to decide? Meanwhile, should we continue to pile up not mountains but mountain ranges of weapons on earth and make preparations to deploy them in space? Later, if we could, would be set up military bases on the moon and make Mars justify its name as the God of War, while the earth goes into a decline. Actually, why be concerned about it, if the politicians have conceded their inability to prevent the worst and have doomed it to extinction?

Can we go on living that way?

Today it is not man who asks nature for favors but nature which is begging man to spare it. All of us, you and us, owe something to nature. You, however, owe the most: developed capitalism, which accounts for 53 percent of global industrial output, also "generates" 63 percent of ecological pollution.

Such percentiles could be converted only approximately and arbitrarily into rubles or dollars, for how to estimate something which has no price such as, for example, the death of animals and plants? A most valuable genetic stock is being lost, the variety of flora and fauna has declined and the mechanism of the most delicate balance in nature has been shaken up. Let us recall the difficulties in contemporary agriculture, are afflicting 100 countries. The Sahara Desert, which is destroying most ancient farming areas, is rapidly moving south. It is possible to stop deserts which have eliminated nearly 5

billion hectares of land, 1 hectare per person on earth. According to the specialists, this would cost \$70 billion between now and the end of this century. If things continue as they are at present, over the next 15 years no less than \$15 trillion will be spent on the arms race. A slight reduction in military expenditures would allow us to mount an offensive against this terrible ailment which is spreading like fire.

Every year the global economy releases into the atmosphere 200 million tons of carbon oxides, more than 50 million tons of hydrocarbons, 100 million tons of ash and 150 million tons of sulfur dioxide, which falls back on earth as "acid rain," mercilessly turning Europe into a "balding continent." Coniferous trees are dying out from the Mediterranean to the Baltic shores. We are concerned with this calamity which is affecting our own northern forests.

In the European part of the USSR the level of pollution brought in by winds from the west is approximately 10 times higher than those blowing from the east. However, we are not hurling imprecations. We are calling for cooperation. For that reason we find it hurtful that our difficulty--the Chernobyl accident--triggered in some people in the West gloating, anti-Soviet enthusiasm, and the euphoria of troglodyte passions. Man rose above all other life on the wings of humanism. Today humanism is needed more than ever by the 5 billion people on earth in relations between neighbors and neighboring countries. In my view, developing a new style of thinking is the core of change in the life of the global community. All change begins in the mind. Not a new technical thinking, embodied in more accurate and merciless weaponry systems, but the liberation of the mind from prejudices--political and social, national and racial, arrogance, self-confidence and the cult of force and violence--is the path to the salvation of civilization and life itself.

Let me note in conclusion that our time is running extremely fast. A great many events and visible changes are happening in your country and ours, in the world at large, very quickly. "Time is money." This is true. However, time means, above all, life in the direct and, now, in the political sense. We must hastily free ourselves, our children and our descendants from worries and dangers. We, in our country, are restructuring and changing our political way of thinking, updating it with the realities of the nuclear-missile, space and computer age. We expect the same of everyone else, of you, Americans.

I declare that we have no whatsoever evil or secret intentions concerning your country or any hostility toward the American people. Anyone who says differently is simply a criminal. We respect the people of the United States.

I take this opportunity to wish each everyone of my readers and his family and the great American people happiness and prosperity.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

THE CONCEPT OF ACCELERATION -- POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ASPECTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 13-24

[Article by Stepan Aramaisovich Sitaryan, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member]

[Text] The concept of the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development is of fundamental and determining significance in the scientific understanding and practical evaluation of the revolutionary changes currently taking place in our society.

The innovative nature and tremendous mobilizing power of the acceleration concept are that it contains a clear historical prospect for the development of socialism and an efficient program for practical action aimed at raising it to a qualitatively new condition.

We know that the theoretical views which prevailed in the past 20 years were essentially dominated by concepts which allowed for a transition to a more mature state of socialism through purely evolutionary means through the simple accumulation of quantitative factors. It was no accident, therefore, that differences among the individual stages in the development of our society were characterized exclusively by their qualitative evaluation and their scale. The study of the profound processes which predetermine them was pushed into the background. Nonetheless, both science and historical practice keep proving that a socioeconomic system cannot be considered a frozen phenomenon subject merely to evolutionary quantitative changes. Radical shifts take place within it, which predetermine the conversion to a new qualitative level of development.

The present article is an attempt to interpret some problems which affect essential political and economic features of the concept of acceleration in their inseparable unity: the supreme objective of acceleration, its sources and the ways and means of achieving it.

The New Quality of Growth Is the Pivot of the Concept of Acceleration

In describing the economic essence of this concept, it would be an extreme oversimplification to reduce it to a purely quantitative increase in growth rates and to consider it exclusively as a policy aimed at surmounting the

drastic slowdown in the growth of the most important indicators of the national economy, the national income above all, which developed in the 1970s and beginning of 1980s.

The concept of "acceleration," which synthesizes the overall meaning and object of the concept is deeper and broader. On the political and economic level, it does not consist of the pace itself but of achieving a new quality of growth, which is the only possible foundation under contemporary circumstances in making socialism dynamic and renovating all of its aspects.

The theory of economic growth and the methodology of its analysis do not allow any separation between pace and its source and quality. It is important, therefore, above all to determine whether the factors of growth are extensive or intensive. Furthermore, the pace reflects only the relative indicators of economic growth. In assessing its quality we must, however, take into consideration the increased "weight" of each percentile, its structure and composition, the quality of goods, and their technical and consumer features. Finally, the sectorial structure of public production and the composition and correlation between the finished and the intermediary product are of substantial significance.

Consequently, the pace and the process of its shaping are phenomena which are by no means self-satisfying but the result of the interaction of a series of factors and conditions which, in the final account, determine the quality of economic growth.

In considering from such positions the dynamics of Soviet economic growth, we can note that as a whole it is characterized by a rather impressive rate. Nonetheless, we must point out that the aggressive nature of our movement has by no means been smooth. The national income increased most rapidly during the prewar 5-year periods. Its average annual rate exceeded 14 percent between 1928 and 1940; between 1945 and 1970 the average annual growth rate of the national income was about 10 percent, despite some declines in some years.

Between 1970 and 1983, however, the average annual rate dropped by approximately one-half. However, it was not merely a matter of a rather sharp decline in this indicator. The extremely adverse trend of a steady slowdown in the pace was noted in the 1970s. The rate continued to decline from one 5-year period to another. Whereas in 1966-1970 the growth rate of the national income averaged 7.8 percent, it dropped to 3.6 percent in the 1981-1982 period.

Let us note that both the practical and theoretical slowdown of the pace is entirely admissible within a short plan interval, if a structural and investment regrouping takes place in the economy or a step is taken to promote its further accelerated growth. Practical experience has indicated, however, that a slowdown of economic growth within a long planned interval is not only inadmissible but even dangerous. Such development means nothing other than a narrowing of the economic base for expanded reproduction, for a drop in the pace one 5-year period after another cannot be compensated with the increased "weight" of percentages and inevitably leads to a drop in the absolute growth of the national income. In the 10th 5-year period, despite the increased

"weight" of a percentile point of the national income, compared with the 9th 5-year period, from 2.8 to 3.7 billion rubles, the value of the absolute growth of the national income declined as a result of the substantial drop in the average annual growth rates. This substantially limited possibilities of solving production and social problems simultaneously.

What was the nature of this process and was it preventable? Profound and thorough answers to these questions are found in the documents of the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the 27th Party Congress and the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, leading to entirely clear conclusions. The drop in the rates of economic growth in recent 5-year periods was not inevitable. Nor was it fatally predetermined by the increased scale of our output, although a connection between the scale of the economy and its pace does exist. This connection, however, is not a rigid and simple correlation which ties any slowdown in pace to an increased scale.

In this case the main feature is not the scale of reproduction but in the base on which it takes place and the factors involved in attaining a specific growth rate.

Without undertaking to study all factors which determined the high growth rates of the national income before the war and during the first postwar 5-year periods, let us note that decisive among them was the steadily growing extensive base of economic development. Its high growth rates were based on the possibility of increasingly involving all kinds of resources in production, labor as well as material, and maintaining high growth rates of capital investments. However, by the start of the 1970s the situation in the economy began to change substantially. Opportunities for a quantitative growth of extensive factors became increasingly limited, while the growth of intensive factors was extremely slow. The gap between them not only did not narrow but even widened. The exhaustion of extensive factors was not compensated with a respective increase in intensive factors, which predetermined the intensification of the process of obstructing the dynamics of the national income.

This is the profound and primary reason for the slowdown in the pace of economic growth. It was worsened by the existing structure of public production and investment policy, which were increasingly conflicting with the social objectives in the development of our society. In turn, this adversely affected the development of the production process and its efficiency. With the increasingly restricted extensive sources of development, efforts to maintain high growth rates inevitably weakened economic demand for the quality of output, its updating, consumer features and technical standards. This substantially lowered the level of output and the full satisfaction of the growing needs of society, resulting in disproportions and waste.

Under circumstances in which the possibilities of extensive economic growth have been exhausted, an acceleration of the pace can be achieved only on a qualitatively different basis, through the all-round intensification of output. The possibility is not excluded of achieving acceleration on the old basis for a certain period of time, through the maximal mobilization of organizational-economic and current reserves, as occurred, for example, in the

final years of the 11th 5-year period. However, such growth can be only temporary and unstable if not accompanied by an increase in intensive factors. This is the key to answering the question of ways of acceleration.

What are the most important components of the new quality of growth? First, a drastic reorientation in the sources of growth of public production from primarily extensive to intensive, so that intensive factors may assume a determining role in increasing economic growth; second, maximal reliance on scientific and technical progress and on its inexhaustible and revolutionizing possibilities of restructuring production and resource conservation; third, achieving a radical change in the technical, consumer and economic characteristics of output, which lead to a qualitatively different nature of the social product and the national income; fourth, a drastic change in the structure and proportions of the public product through its increased maximizing of finished goods and reducing the share of the intermediary product; fifth, the consistent growing orientation of public production toward the implementation of its final objective by harmonizing the sectorial structure of the economy and, finally, sixth, the all-round enhancement of the human factor and its reproduction role as a powerful source of economic growth.

Unquestionably, all of these components are internally interrelated. It is only the comprehensive reorganization of the sources of growth, the quality and structure of output and the comprehensive utilization of powerful boosters of modern progress, such as science and the human factor, that can lead to the new quality of growth which will make the acceleration process stable and expanding.

The 12th 5-Year Plan marked the beginning of this process. Its purpose is not only to stop the negative features in economic development, which had developed in the past, but also to lead the economy to a new quality of growth.

Economic Management Reform Is the Main Prerequisite for Acceleration

The conversion of the economy to a new qualitative condition is a complex and conflicting process. Its implementation will require a powerful economic-organizational impetus capable of surmounting the inertia of the existing type of development and eliminating its obstructing factors. The concept of acceleration not only provides a scientific substantiation of the need for a new quality of growth but also defines the ways and means of achieving it. Decisive among them are the reform of the economic mechanism and the all-round democratization of the entire management process, the purpose of which is to eliminate the ways and means of planning and economic management which had been practiced for decades and replace them with new methods consistent with the intensive type of economic growth.

Considerable progress was made in the practical implementation of the reform within a relatively short time. It began with the main unit of the national economic complex--enterprises and associations--and is affecting ever new economic sectors and levels of management. Let us particularly emphasize the tremendous importance of the draft USSR Law on the State Enterprise

(Association), the purpose of which is to lay the foundations for building an integral management system, largely to predetermine the overall trend and pace of planned changes, to make the new economic mechanism an organic part of our economic system and to make this process irreversible.

Nonetheless, for the time being we are only at the beginning of the road. Therefore, the more intensive development of basic problems of the theory and practice of socialist management acquires great importance. Without it empiricism and pragmatism may take over in course of future changes, thus violating the internal harmony in developing the individual elements of management, vertically as well as horizontally, and securing their comprehensive and purposeful nature. This becomes even more important today, when the process of restructuring is found in the progress from the old to the new and when the pace, scale and depth of changes in individual areas and on different levels of management are not always coincidental, which creates difficulties and contradictions in the practical implementation of plans.

We know that on a broad political and economic level the problem of management under socialism is reduced, in the final account, to the optimal combination of the interest of society with those of the collective and the individual. Looking at the entire range of changes which have taken place in the country after the October Revolution we can conclude that our society has invariably and intensively sought optimal models for the type of economic management structure which would enable us to take most fully into consideration the interests of society, the collective and the individual and to find a rational combination among the three.

Depending on the tasks which face the country and the depth of knowledge of the very essence of socialism as a socioeconomic system, the aspect of this model and the extent of optimization of interests were, naturally, by no means identical. But whenever difficulties and deformations in the development of the economy appeared and whenever a search was undertaken for new approaches to management, one way or another we came across the problem of interest, clearly realizing that it was precisely the disturbance of its mechanism of interrelationships that was the deep-seated reasons for negative processes.

Notwithstanding the variety of ways and means of optimizing the system of interest, their practical functioning is largely based on the solution of two fundamental interrelated problems of socialist economic management: the correlation between centralism and democratic principles in national economic management and the so-called problem of the plan and the market.

As a principle of socialist economic management, democratic centralism is inviolable. It objectively stems from the nature of socialism and its production relations. However, the question of the extent to which the two aspects of this principle can be combined and the methods for their manifestation and implementation was, and remains, extremely topical in the theory and practice of socialism. Considering it from the positions of history, we note that the line separating them has been flexible. However, the centralized principle always had the upper hand and the optimal condition of the management system was based on its unquestionable priority.

In assessing the overall course of the radical reform in management, we can see that today it is moving in the direction of democratic principle: the increase in the rights of enterprises, associations and local authorities, stipulated in the planned reorganizations, is the most extensive in the entire history of development of the Soviet economy. The optimizing of the models of democratic centralism is based on the increased autonomy of primary units within the national economic complex, although the centralized principles of overall economic management have been preserved.

However, this is merely the quantitative aspect of democratic centralism, reflecting the extent of changed correlations between its principles. More important and essential today is its qualitative aspect, which reflects the methods applied in the implementation of these principles and the mechanism used in "coupling" them. More specifically, it is a question of the methods--primarily administrative or primarily economic--applied in the implementation of this principle and the nature of its political and economic content. As experience indicates, this is what determines, in the final account, the degree of optimizing the centralizing and decentralizing principles in the management system and the selection of the respective criteria.

We know that the line separating centralization from decentralization may shift (which has indeed happened) also within the framework of administrative management methods. Such changes, however, have thresholds which are virtually impossible to cross with administrative management methods. If we retain them we cannot ensure the real manifestation of cost accounting rights. Consequently, under present circumstances no radical reform in the economic mechanism is possible without a sharp transition from administrative to economic management methods. In the final account, it is precisely this transition that must determine the nature of the reform and its direction.

On the political and economic level, economic methods (without undertaking a detailed description of all their elements) can better optimize economic interests compared with administrative methods, in which the decisive function in administration and economic management on all levels is assigned to a very detailed system of centralized indicators, which directly regulate virtually all aspects of the production-financial activities of enterprises and associations. Therefore, conversion to economic methods is considered not only a decisive revision of the entire set of planning and economic management instruments but, which is quite important, the systematic application of new methods on all management levels: in the primary unit--enterprises and associations--and on the sectorial and national levels.

We cannot consider accurate the viewpoint that various levels of management could be based on different management methods, such as the claim that centralization could be applied only to administrative methods while decentralization methods and principles could be applied to economic methods. Such a division within a single system by areas using different management methods, allegedly able to coexist perfectly, is theoretically groundless and practically dangerous. Sooner or later this leads to a frustration of economic methods under the dominant influence of administrative methods applied from above.

That is why the first and prime condition for converting the management of the national economy to economic methods is ensuring the universality of this process, so that it may encompass all units and levels of economic management.

During the period of the broad experiment and particularly now economic theory and practice have greatly advanced in terms of understanding the need for and defining the overall trend of the process of intensification of democratic principles in management and expanding the boundaries of economic independence of enterprises as socialist commodity producers and upgrading their role and responsibility in the country's economic life. The logic of development of this process led to the idea of self-support and self-financing of enterprises as the most consistent and complete form of implementation of the principles of cost accounting at the present stage. Today this idea has assumed fully defined outlines. A mechanism has been developed for the practical application of cost accounting. As to the upper management levels, ministries and national economic agencies above all, which essentially mean centralized management means and methods, no real clarity exists as yet concerning the nature of the forthcoming changes. A search is under way and debates are taking place. The overall concept is clear: the centralized principle cannot be subject to "erosions," for this would mean the loss of one of the greatest advantages of socialism. This principle must be given a new content and new forms and organizational structures.

Theoretical efforts made at belittling the idea of the centralized principle in socialist economic management and weakening the role of the USSR Gosplan, as its leading unit, could cause irreparable harm. Without denying the justice of the criticism addressed to the central economic authorities, we must not forget that in principle the planned and proportional functioning of our economy as a whole, as a single national economic complex, and its purposeful development, which requires the coordinated action of all of its units and, finally, the efficient functioning of the mechanism for the exercise of the principle of ownership by the whole nation, cannot be ensured without centralized socialist economic management. Therefore, we can and must discuss the ways and means of implementing this principle, the functions of the national economic authorities and the radical restructuring of their activities, dominated by the administrative-command principle; in no case, however, should we consider the elimination of such functions. The main thing is to ensure that they are implemented through economic means and are organically linked to the functional system of the primary units, based on full cost accounting and self-financing.

The most promising trends in the solution of this problem include the application in planning and incentive practices of a system of economic standards and state orders. They must become the bearing structure of the new economic mechanism and greatly to reorganize the entire technology used in the formulation of the plan.

Another prerequisite for the wholeness of the economic system is the coordination among all of its elements and units. This stipulation is based on the interpretation of our own practical experience. The management system which developed in the 1930s and 1940s had its own economic logic and was characterized by an inner unity and harmony among all of its elements and

units, from top to bottom. Virtually all control lines led to the top and the centralized plan included the entire expanded system of indicators and assignments which determined the volume and variety of output, capital investments, contracting limits and material outlays. This meant that not only were the parameters of growth planned but their material support and marketing were guaranteed. All subsequent work of the management mechanism was reduced to the gradual lowering of assignment breakdowns to the level of enterprises and supervising their implementation. This was consistent with the strict system for the funded organization of material and technical procurements, which realistically supported the plan with resources, a primarily budget financing of all outlays and highly centralized pricing and wage systems.

Such were the elements of the management system based on administrative methods.

For that reason, retaining any one of them in the new system in the manner in which it functioned in the old would inevitably disturb the integrity of the system. This means that the use in economic practice of new methodology and technology in formulating the plan as starting points for restructuring all management should be backed by corresponding systems of material and technical industrial procurements, financial relations, price setting and wages.

The all-round scientific development of the entire set of such problems greatly depends on the proper understanding of the interaction between centralized planning and commodity-monetary relations or the interaction between the plan and the market.

The materials of the 27th CPSU Congress and the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum define important basic views in understanding the nature of commodity-monetary relations.

If we judge socialism on the basis of experience, as Lenin taught, and not from books only, we can say that with the exception of the period of war communism, despite all debates and incantations, commodity-monetary relations were a reality of our economic life, for their sources were rooted in socialist production relations rather than imported from the outside on someone's order. Socialism, with its planning and public ownership of means of production, did not eliminate but instead gave them a new content and the problem was, and remains, one of understanding the functioning of such relations, mastering them and finding efficient mechanisms for practical control of categories such as prices, profits, finances and credit. This is particularly important now, for the conversion to economic methods of centralized management and to the principles of full cost accounting and self-financing will largely depend on success in the development of new approaches to the entire price-setting system, increasing the role of profits in the plan and self-financing, expanding the realm of activities of other commodity values and instruments and developing wholesale trade in means of production.

In the search for new solutions we must interpret more profoundly the lessons of our own experience and clearly visualize the qualitatively new problems which must be solved in the course of the reform. Frequently, in searching

for answers to many questions, efforts are made directly to make the current economic management mechanism part of commodity-monetary instruments used during the NEP. This is motivated by the fact that it was precisely then that the most successful interconnection between the plan and the market were achieved. Naturally, the principles of the NEP deserve thorough study and utilization. The essence of the matter, however, lies elsewhere: the extent to which it is accurate automatically to apply the old approach to the solution of the problem of the plan and the market as it exists today. At that time there could not even be a question of a plan such as we have today, for a plan as such did not exist as yet. It was only beginning to be outlined economically and organizationally. The problem of the interconnection between plan and market at that time lay elsewhere and was solved on another level. Considering the underdeveloped nature of planning in the economy, the lack of new tools and adequate planning ideology, the state's planned influence on the economy was exercised mainly through commodity-monetary and, above all, financial and taxation instruments, which influenced the producers of commodities, the market and price setting, curbing the then inevitable lack of control and channeling the overall course of economic development toward building socialism, not to mention the fact that the social structure of the economy itself was different. It was mixed. Unity and interconnection among its individual systems could be achieved only by organizing commodity-monetary exchanges between them. All of this combined was what determined the tremendous importance which the mastery of commodity-monetary tools for controlling the economy and Lenin's persistent call for learning how to trade had at that time. The unique experience acquired then remains of tremendous scientific and practical interest. However, today the economic situation is different. Planning became dominant in the economy and, as an economic and political category, the plan became comprehensive and acquired its own set of instruments, which included both direct and indirect methods of influencing the development of the national economy and enterprise activities and regulating the overall development of the process of reproduction and its pace, proportions and structure. Under these circumstances the problem of the plan and the market appears essentially different and requires new approaches in ensuring their organic and interrelated functioning within the framework of a unified system of national economic management. The following problems, which we consider most important, could be named and the practical solution of which will greatly predetermine the accurate interaction between the plan and the market, centralized planning and commodity-monetary relations.

First, ensuring the balancing between natural and value proportions in public production on the macrolevel, as the most important prerequisite for the systematic development of the process of expanded socialist reproduction. Second, substantially enhancing the role of prices as a reliable gauge of socially necessary outlays and production results under self-financing conditions, and strengthening their regulatory functions in attaining an efficient balance between supply and demand on the industrial and consumer markets, as one of the means of increasing the role of the ruble and its purchasing power. Third, achieving the necessary interconnection and coordination in the dynamics of monetary and material resources of enterprises and associations, as the most important condition for the practical implementation of the principle of self-financing. Fourth, formulating new and more advanced approaches to shaping a system of economic standards,

flexibly combining the requirements of centralized planning with the law of value. Fifth, radically increasing contractual forms of relations between enterprises and superior authorities in the formulation of plans, in marketing and in developing wholesale trade.

These are some of the problems the solution of which requires an interaction between the plan and the market. Equally important is the choice of new instruments of influence, aimed at implementing the planned assignments under the conditions of intensive methods of economic growth.

As indicated by practical experience, with all their tremendous potential in accelerating economic development, such methods nonetheless include a certain element of unpredictability and uncertainty: economic development under the new quality of growth takes place essentially as a result of conservation of resources and thrift, whereas extensive growth is achieved by increasing the volume of resources.

In the former case the growth of the economy is directly related to the pace and scale of scientific and technical progress; in the second this link is weaker, essentially based on physically increasing the resources needed to fulfill the plan. Therefore, it is one thing when a plan, a long-term plan even more so, includes a real growth in let us say rolled metal and something entirely different in an economy in which perhaps 70 percent of the increased need for rolled metal must come from conservation, considered in the broadest and most modern meaning of the term. In order to achieve this we need direct as well as indirect, financial-price methods which will make it possible for the plan to influence both producers and consumers.

Today the practical ways of solving such problems of economic development are becoming increasingly clear, as reflected in the specific steps contemplated in the new economic mechanism. Economic science must help the practice of economics in achieving the objectives set in the reform.

Improving the Well-Being of the People Is the High Purpose of Acceleration

Looking at the theoretical base and methodology of the concept of acceleration, let us note its clear and consistent social trend. The eventual purpose of the concept is to achieve a new quality in the implementation of the highest objective of socialism, that of upgrading the well-being of the people and ensuring the all-round development of the individual.

Intensifying the social aspect of the economy covers a broad range of problems. Two of them, which are of essential significance, could be singled out: the first deals with changes in structural policy, and the second with perfecting the distribution mechanism.

Socialism is the first social system in history which directly subordinates production to the increased well-being of the people. This concept is confirmed by the entire course of development of our country and the other socialist countries. However, something else is obvious as well: this correlation goes through the structural and investment policy which, in the final account, determines the correlation between the first and second public

production subdivisions. Therefore, in itself the overall growth of output does not determine the pace and scale of increased consumption of goods and services. They are related to the development of sectors which directly work for the satisfaction of individual needs, i.e., for the second subdivision. Therefore, the material base in strengthening the social orientation of the economy is, above all, a change in the structure of public production and of the entire investment policy, the accelerated growth rates of the second subdivision, of group "B" sectors in industry, agriculture, the nonproduction area and services and, naturally, their higher economic returns.

The 12th 5-Year Plan and the long-term plan until the year 2000 call for a change in structural policy, the purpose of which will be strengthen the social emphasis in the development of the economy and raise the well-being of the people to a qualitatively new level. Without engaging in a specific description of such measures, let us note that the process of social reorientation in the development of the economy is directly related to our theoretical concepts of the correlation between the first and second subdivisions in public production under socialism. These concepts, which developed during the early period of our economic building, were clearly dogmatic. To a great extent they were used as the "scientific" foundation for the residual method of social planning. The point is that the law of the priority growth of the first subdivision, compared to the second, which made profound sense as an important material prerequisite for ensuring expanded reproduction, became greatly inflated and was totally reduced to its quantitative interpretations, to a matter of pace. Ignoring specific historical conditions and the real scale of public production, the only acknowledged criterion for the strict application of this law was the equally strict faster development of the growth rates of the first subdivision, of group "A" industry, compared with the second subdivision, with the sectors in group "B." Although subsequently, under the pressure of reality itself, its practical application took a different way, these developed stereotypes led to the adoption of only semiconsistent planning decisions.

The elimination of such shortcomings is one of the topical problems of the science of economics. The sharp structural reorganization of the economy is dictated not by temporary considerations of a circumstantial nature but by the logic of development of socialism and its essential and objective needs at the present stage. A comprehensively developed socialist economy is inconceivable without a harmonious public production structure. This means that it must have not only a powerful heavy industry but also a highly developed set of all sectors producing commodities and services for the population and an expanded social infrastructure. The correlation between these public production subdivisions and economic areas must be based not on some preset and theoretical far-fetched quantitative parameters but on objective interrelationships and ratios dictated by the possibilities and needs in the development of the expanded reproduction process and its overall target.

As practical experience indicates, the planned management of this process is no simple matter. Unlike intersectorial, not to mention intrasectorial, proportions, which are in the guise of rigid technological and physical relations, general economic proportions are more flexible and go through value relations, for which reason their balancing is more complex and important.

However, without solving this problem the overall proportionality of the economy may be disturbed. Consumption, as Lenin wrote, is one of the elements of proportionality. This applies even more so to a socialist economy. The widened gap between the rising needs of the people and the production of consumer goods, between solvent demand and supply of commodities and services, is nothing other than a manifestation of a disturbance in the internal interconnection within the economy and a manifestation of one of its profound disproportions. Therefore, the elimination of such processes and the increased socialist orientation in economic development are among the most important requirements of the strategy of acceleration and a mandatory prerequisite for reaching a new quality in improving the well-being of the Soviet people.

The social effect of the restructuring of public production could be, all other conditions being equal, the higher the more advanced the distribution mechanism in socialism becomes. The concept that with the increased volume of consumer goods and services the problem of their distribution is simplified is by no means. Conversely, paradoxical though this might seem, it becomes more complex and requires new approaches to the solution of problems which seemed simple to answer in the past. In our view, the closest attention, from the political and economic aspects, should be paid to the interconnection between the distribution mechanism and social justice under socialism. It is within it that all other problems of social policy are concentrated, the sum total of which constitute the basis for enhancing the human factor as the main motive force of socioeconomic progress.

The question of social justice and equality is not new. However, Marxism alone has been able to provide a scientific answer to this vital problem. Its essence is that its deep roots are found in the nature of economic relations, in the process of the production and distribution of material goods. It is precisely on the basis of the separation of social justice from its material foundation, despite the very noble motivations and civic courage of the authors of the first socialist views, that the theory of the simple equalized distribution in the society of the future were shaped. The moral power of these theories is so great that to this day, 1 century later, when socialism has not only acquired a scientific base but has also become reality, equalization continues to live in the mentality of the people, making its way in practical affairs and disturbing the organic link between the measures of labor and consumption.

In its final, real, economic sense, equality in consumption means distribution according to need, which can be achieved only under communism. It is at this point that need itself becomes the natural criterion determining the measure of consumption. Under socialism it is human labor, its quantity and quality, that are the economically justified and socially equitable measures of consumption. This is the essence of socialist equality which, as Marx said, is measured equally through labor. Consequently, the solution of the problem of social justice in the material sphere under socialism consists, above all, of the systematic practical implementation of the principle of distribution according to labor and the radical improvement of the entire organization of the wage system. As we know, important practical steps are being taken today in this direction.

Naturally, the implementation of such measures will make the mechanism for the implementation of the socialist principle of distribution according to labor more consistent and, therefore, make rewards for labor more equitable. In this case it is extremely important to lift any artificial restrictions in wages which, essentially, are nothing other than a variety of equalization, harming above all the interests of those working people who can and want to work better, restrictions which hinder the growth of labor productivity.

The enhancement of the distribution mechanism at the present stage cannot be limited merely to perfecting the wage system. It must inevitably become part of the social consumption funds. These funds account for more than one-third of the overall volume of consumption of material and spiritual goods. That is why the problem of their establishment, distribution and utilization must not be separated from the overall objectives and tasks related to the country's socioeconomic development. We shall name three important areas in which it is not only possible but also necessary to intensify the socioeconomic efficiency of public consumption funds.

The first is the standardized conversion of the entire planned procedure for their distribution. The development of such principles must be based on a reliable scientific foundation. This will enable us to eliminate frequent cases of groundless variety in the consumption of social goods in the various parts of the country and, at the same time, avoid the temptation of mechanical equalization based on the criterion of the actually existing minimum. Second, a more systematic and broad decentralization of the process governing the formation and utilization of the individual types of social funds, dictated by the conversion of enterprises and associations to the principles of full cost accounting and self-financing. This will enable us to relate the social development of labor collectives to the results of their work and thus to enhance incentives found in the social consumption funds. Third, the interaction between the system of paid and free services must become more flexible and efficient. This will enable the working people to satisfy better than is possible today not only their material but also a number of their social needs out of their personal income, and thus to increase the incentive to earn such funds.

Such are some of the problems we consider topical in connection with the various political and economic aspects of the concept of acceleration. Their subsequent intensified and comprehensive study will enable us to advance more confidently and purposefully on the path of restructuring and the practical implementation of the strategic stipulations of the 27th CPSU Congress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

ECONOMIC THEORY AND PRACTICE OF RESTRUCTURING: A. RUMYANTSEV AND I. LUKINOV
ANSWER QUESTIONS FROM 'KOMMUNIST'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 25-34

[Text] We continue our publication of answers by economists to questions related to the condition and prospects of development of the science of economics under the conditions of restructuring (see Nos 5 and 6 for 1987).

Academician A.M. Rumyantsev:

1. If we speak of economic science as such and of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of socialist reality, it was precisely such an analysis that was the base for the very important problems and the revolutionary nature of the means contemplated for their solution that were adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress. This means that the accusation that economists have ignored vital problems in the 20 years preceding the congress does not apply to all of them.

In terms of official (institutionalized) plans for scientific research and developments of many practical economists, it can be said that they essentially rested on the obsolete administrative plan based on directives or, to quote V.I. Lenin, on the use of a method for economic centralization which had assumed "drastic dictatorial forms" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 200). This meant the strict obedience of lower administrative levels to superior ones and the implementation of all instructions issued by the latter with a minimal expedient autonomy of enterprises in the formulation and implementation of the state national economic plan. This charge leveled at such economists is absolutely right.

However, in the course of their individual creative work, many researchers closely studied the condition of the Soviet economy and sought answers to the existing situation. The need to grant enterprises economic autonomy and the conversion to scientific-production associations as basic economic units and the organization of contractual relations between consuming and supplying enterprises were substantiated in books, articles and reports. Attention was focused on the laws governing the functioning of commodity-monetary relations and the law of value under socialism, and the conversion of enterprises to full cost accounting and self-financing. There were intensive "private" exchanges of views at various scientific meetings. Experiments, such as the Shchekino, were initiated.

One way or another, the main idea was voiced, that of converting from an administrative method of economic centralization to what Lenin described as a "soft guidance by a conductor" (Ibid.), to truly democratic means. The latter are based on enhancing the activeness, creativity and autonomy of the broad masses in the formulation and implementation of plans for the development of the national economy. In the majority of cases, however, all of this was left hanging in the air, lacking official support. Virtually no feedback reached the leading authorities.

2. The basic trends in economic restructuring formulated by the 27th Party Congress (the economic mechanism above all), outline the general problem of research. The core of this problem is the formulation, on the one hand, of the theoretical foundations for upgrading the efficiency of the centralized management of the national economy as a single entity (in its organic interaction with the local areas) and, on the other, the principles of truly ensuring the broadest possible democratization of the country's economic life. It is precisely this double task which is the most important and the least developed by our science, for which reason it needs the concentrated efforts of the economists.

What do we consider the most relevant aspect in solving this problem?

First, we must provide a scientific definition of the concept of sensible needs of all members of society. We must develop an efficient method for their consideration and anticipation and changes in their specific content. This must become a reliable foundation for national economic planning, a foundation for eliminating the essentially extensive planning method based "on the achieved level." The accurate scientific classification of sensible needs will determine the choice of priorities and volumes of output and the formulation of the balances of material, labor and financial resources.

Second, we must develop the theory of forecasting that which will be vitally necessary for the socialist society of the future (and not simply extrapolate current conditions). Correspondingly, we must develop the economic aspects of timely "social orders" concerning science and technology (naturally, which will not hinder but will encourage independent research by scientists and scientific collectives).

Third, we must develop a concept of guided development of the foundations of social production forces and their dominant feature (which is also the dominant feature of production relations): the person as the true (and not the nominal) co-owner and co-producer.

Fourth, we must develop the Leninist thesis of the socialist product which, while remaining a commodity, is, at the same time, "not a commodity in the political-economic sense or, in any case, not merely a commodity, no longer a commodity...." (op cit., vol 43, p 276). We must determine the specific nature of the correlation within this product of consumer values and production costs, which will help us to determine the functional features of the law of value under socialism.

3-4. The essence of the essentially revolutionary nature of changes in the system of our production relations is not a change of their nature as relations within the public ownership of means of production but in the already noted transition to the guiding ("conductor") means of economic management. Consequently, it is above all a question of a radical restructuring of the economic mechanism, which ensures progress in economic relations (and thus in the public mentality, an enhancement of collective awareness and responsible collective action by all members of society).

The prevalence of national ownership of means of production is the qualitative, basic and firm feature which separates the system of communist (socialist) production relations from all other past and present production relation system. However, the unchallenged domination of such ownership does not mean the automatic conversion of every member of society into a real co-owner/co-producer, a true collectivist free from the mentality and habits of private ownership, which took centuries to develop. This also applies to the level reached in the development of socialism. The creation of the necessary objective conditions for creative and responsible work by everyone for the social good is, precisely, the purpose of the revolutionary economic restructuring carried out by the whole nation, under the party's guidance.

Do revolutionary changes affect the fundamental structures of the socialist economic base? In terms of said relations of nation-wide ownership of means of production as basic and fundamental, such changes do not affect the base, in the sense that they are neither eliminated nor replaced. Yet it is not only possible but also necessary to speak of strengthening, of ensuring the fuller use of the opportunities provided by the basic production relations under socialism.

This is directly related to improving the structure of the national economy and optimizing within it correlations of national production, cooperation, individual labor activeness by the members of the socialist society and mixed production methods.

Restructuring leads above all to enhancing the role of national output as the leading sector. It is a question, above all, of increasing the responsibility of autonomous state enterprises for the implementation of the national economic plan most efficiently, ensuring procurements on the basis of economic contracts and efficiently managing foreign trade. The better utilization of the basic socioeconomic advantages of socialism becomes possible on the basis of upgrading the "responsible autonomy" of enterprises.

At the same time, cooperated economic management, which is a form of socialist relations, becomes greatly. In close relation to production by the whole people, cooperation (both industrial and consumer) enhances the level of socialization, particularly in areas still insufficiently included in nation-wide forms of management, thus allowing us to harness additional manpower.

Cooperative relations have a number of democratic features which could be used on a national basis. Such use is entirely consistent with the overall democratization and with the guiding ("conductor") method applied in economic centralization.

The present course of social stimulation of individual labor activity by the members of socialist society is of particular interest. The concept was that such activities exceed the boundaries of socialism. However, if individual labor activity, excluding the use of hired labor, is organized in forms controlled by society and focused on socially useful work and provides additional channels for applying the capabilities and forces of individuals in the interest of society (which remain unused by national and cooperative enterprises), why should such activities be considered as exceeding the limits of socialist relations at the specific level reached in their development? Furthermore, today individual labor activity is most frequently interwoven with the basic work of the individual in various public production areas. Individual labor activity satisfies population demand for commodities and services not provided by socialized production. Labor tools are purchased by individual working people with their own funds, in accordance with Soviet marketing procedures. The product of individual labor activity will be rated on the basis of state, cooperative and kolkhoz market prices. Consequently, the income earned by the individual working person is related to a healthy, socialist application of the law of value (naturally, this applies only to a labor income; unearned income is a violation of socialist relations, punishable by society).

Therefore, relations of individual labor activity (which show the same trend of becoming cooperative activities) together with cooperative and mixed production relations are a "subform" of socialist ownership relations, in which nation-wide production plays a dominant role. The latter covers the decisive areas and trends in the development of the national economy and is extended, in a way, into "subforms." Naturally, the specific nature of such subforms changes in time. Each one of them, however, influences as "feedback" the development of democratization in basic production relations.

Such relations are regulated above all by the basic economic law of socialism, which expresses the following objective cause and effect tie: if the public ownership of means of production (cause) dominates in society, the production process is directly subordinated to the satisfaction of the needs of all members of society (effect). This link objectively determines the common target of economic management—ensuring the full well-being and free and all-round development of all members of society. The more profoundly and extensively the masses become aware of the nature of this law and the objective of economic management it creates, the clearer the correlation between private and common interest becomes and the stronger becomes the economic link among members of society as co-owners and co-producers.

Naturally, it is not a question of the needs of the members of society in general but only of sensible (industrial and personal) needs, worthy of the individual. Consequently, this cause and effect link calls for solving the problem of the social usefulness of the various types of goods and services. Knowledge of the basic law means also knowledge of the objective foundations for the appearance, development and enhancement of sensible needs. We must also consider the problem of the complex interconnection between the basic law and the level of development of production forces and their actual utilization by society. At each specific stage this interconnection determines the local limit of implementation of the requirements of the law and its influence on

the progress of production forces. The more dynamic the conscious use of the law becomes, the better sensible needs are satisfied and the faster they grow, the more significant becomes the inverse stimulation of the effect of the law on the production process and on the development of social production forces and their dominant feature itself--man's creative capabilities. Such is, in its general features, the role of the basic law, the drastic increase in the efficiency of the utilization of which is the most important feature of the changes occurring today in our economy.

The basic economic law is a prerequisite for the study of the economic nature of socialism, also expressed in the law of planned development of the national economy and of the proportional sensible needs of the members of society. The subordination of public production to the direct satisfaction of such needs can be achieved only with a conscious rather than uncontrolled harmony in the activities of labor collectives. In other words, it can be achieved through the joint formulation of a uniform plan for the development of public production for the sake of achieving the common economic objective. This is inconceivable without defining the objective scale of the sensible needs of society and the existing material and manpower resources for their satisfaction and the choice of priority trends of development (which ensure the expansion of such possibilities), the apportioning of overall labor and material facilities among the various public production units and the functioning of the national economy as an integral organism.

The plan must inform, guide and unite the masses and thus ensure nationwide economic management. Aware of the objective requirements of the law of planned development of the national economy, the labor collectives develop their creative autonomy and actively seek the most efficient ways of implementing their planned assignments. In the course of this quest new questions arise relating to the development of public production and presuming coordinated decisions.

Naturally, the planned management of the unified economy by society is possible only on a systematic basis. Lenin developed the concept of democratic centralism in the economy, implemented with the help of the economic mechanism created by society (which changes its forms at different stages), with its main lever: centralized planning of the development of nationwide production.

The need for and essence of democratic centralism in the economy, according to Lenin, are determined by the fact that socialist socialized production, based on industrial technology, objectively presumes centralized management, economic management "by the entire society." Centralism is introduced not "from above" but by the will of the entire society of working people, which is the single owner of the means of production. The co-owners/co-producers, equal in terms of rights and obligations, elect locally their own representatives, who become the central authorities and who are entrusted with overall leadership. The center is accountable and responsible to all members of the association of the whole people. The authorities which are needed to manage the national economy are based on the principle of elections (competition) and accountability to society. Their activities rely on openness, criticism and self-criticism, and discussion by the masses of all

problems outside work and strict labor and technological discipline at work (in order to achieve the common economic objective). The implementation of formulated and adopted plans must be based on the high level of activeness, creativity, initiative, independence and competitiveness in specific actions, in the course of which all labor collectives and their individual members assume full responsibility. Decision-making on all levels of planned economic management is based on majority rule and must be obeyed by the minority.

Such are the most important features of the law of planned development, which are so tangibly and specifically embodied today in the stipulations of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which called for the comprehensive democratization of economic life.

It is precisely the need to surmount stagnation and negative trends in the economy and the restoration of the Leninist principle of centralism in its truly democratic aspect that urgently required a revolutionary type of restructuring. To sum it up, let us note that its main features are the following: defining the sensible needs of society; concentrating the efforts and capabilities of all members of society on the implementation of stressed plans for the development of the national economy in its priority areas; eliminating the old work methods and democratically revising means of staffing the economic mechanism with cadres. All of this stems from the very foundations of the nature of the socialist economic base, as embodied in the basic economic law and the law of planned development.

Therefore, it is not the elimination of the laws of ownership by the whole people, which are the core of the basic structures of the socialist economy, but firmly undertaking the proper observance of their requirements that is the essence of the revolution within the system of socialist economic management. Naturally, the full content of revolutionary changes is considerably broader. It includes qualitative improvements in the application of the other economic laws, including the laws of saving time and value, and the various groups of socialist production relations, some of which we discussed.

I.I. Lukinov, vice president of the UkSSR Academy of Science, director of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and member of the USSR Academy of Sciences:

1-2. In my view, the science of economics was unprepared to provide such answers. The critical remarks to which it was subjected were deserved. In depicting the period of stagnation in their own fashion, many political economists, unfortunately, either plunged into senseless abstract arguments or engaged in discussions of universally known concepts and stipulations issued "from above," instead of engaging in basic studies of real processes of economic activities. Hence the predominance, for a long period of time, of one-sided interpretations of the nature and forms of manifestation of ownership relations and their interaction with production forces, commodity-monetary, cost accounting and distribution relations, and the theory of price and financial-credit controls.

The concept of "naturalizing" economic relations under socialism, which was used in its time to substantiate the "main trend" in converting to the higher

stage of the communist system, one way or another encouraged erroneous concepts according to which the faster commodity-monetary exchange is eliminated the faster we shall reach our target. Some supporters of such views substantiated the need to eliminate money under socialism in connection with converting to a direct labor equivalent of trade. It was even claimed that the Soviet ruble is no longer a currency but something like a voucher for direct bartering operations. The substantiated criticism of such views was confirmed by the practical experience of socialist economic management. The development of public production was accompanied not by the elimination but the expansion of commodity-monetary relations, which increasingly became part of a planned and regulated trend.

For decades the question of commodity-monetary relations under socialism remained a topic of sharp and sterile debates between "pro-commodity" and "anti-commodity" supporters. Theoretical efforts in this area as well were diverted from undertaking work on economic problems of truly prime importance.

The aspiration to ensure the fastest possible merger of the two forms of socialist ownership under a single banner of accelerated conversion to the higher stage of the communist system contributed to the mass administrative conversion of a significant number of kolkhozes into sovkhoses, the elimination of craft cooperatives and the curtailment of the private auxiliary plots of kolkhoz members. In addition to state ownership, as being closer than others to the future communist ownership, all other forms of ownership were frequently presented as temporary phenomena alien to socialism. Other similar examples could be cited as well.

In principle, cost accounting relations under socialism have always been accepted as one of the most important methods of socialist economic management. However, this acknowledgment was not the same for the state and the cooperative forms. Whereas in the case of kolkhozes cost accounting was interpreted as a feature of their internal economic nature, an entirely different interpretation was given in the case of state enterprises. Economic responsibility for the end results of their activities was essentially assumed by the state. Hence the theory and practice of "partial" or "curtailed" cost accounting, which did not actively encourage labor collectives to achieve high efficiency. Investment financing with budget funds, covering losses and replenishing the wage fund in full, regardless of results, created dependency.

The new economic strategy radically changes this attitude toward the nature and form of cost accounting relations, setting for labor collectives conditions of strict control of outlays and results on each level of economic management, through the ruble, and ensuring high return on resources and profitability. Today this is the economic foundation not only for creating favorable prerequisites for meeting the planned pace of reproduction and technical updating of the economy, but also the social well-being of the labor collective and its individual members. An impartial analysis proves the groundlessness of the aspiration of some supporters of the preservation of the old economic management methods of treating cost accounting as a "scarecrow," frightening others with the loss of the advantages of socialism, weakening of centralized planning, impossibility of materialization of monetary resources, increased differentiation and stratification of labor collectives and working

people, based on the level of their well-being, etc. Conversely, under conditions of true cost accounting, centralized planned management should become substantially stronger and gain truly effective and active opportunities for implementing the structural, investment, price and financial-credit policies of the state.

Fundamental studies made of complex and contradictory socioeconomic processes, scientific forecasting extended to the foreseeable future and formulation of theories relative to highly efficient socialist economic management and the new economic management mechanism demand the concentration of scientific efforts. These are most relevant problems which must be solved immediately and on a strictly scientific basis.

In addition to identifying the objective laws governing global and local processes and the factors which determine them, economic theory must bring to light possibilities of future economic changes. The difficulty of the present situation in the science of economics is worsened by the fact that for a number of years many of its areas had been ignored and had surrendered already occupied positions. This also applies to accountability and statistics, which fell incredibly behind in terms of theory and methodology and are unable to ensure the use of all opportunities provided by contemporary computer systems by economists. There is essentially no substantial increase in knowledge in the area of the grave currency and financial problems of socialism and the development of its domestic and foreign markets.

Economic intensification, the purpose of which is drastically to upgrade efficiency this 5-year period and in the 1990s, is impossible without the elimination of existing negative trends in the national economy and the application of the achievements of scientific and technical progress. Let us remember that the adverse effect of the outlay mechanism and the restoration of the principle of equalization and stagnation in technological, structural and qualitative renovation were reflected, as in a mirror, in the decline in the cost accounting recovery of capital and working assets of industrial enterprises and in the reduced growth rates of the national income.

Even in the most dynamic industrial sectors the speed at which worn-out machines and equipment are written off remains low; they are essentially replaced by similar machines and the old extensive technologies are retained, although they are unable to generate radical changes in labor productivity and which obstruct the growth of efficiency. A reconstruction based on this fact has a particularly weak influence on reducing production cost and resource conservation. There even were "theoreticians," who argued that scientific and technical progress made increased production costs inevitable. Nonetheless, worldwide and best domestic experience proved that the high cost of contemporary science-intensive production systems, based on complex robot and computer-intensive technology ensure increased results by increasing quantity and quality and reducing the labor intensiveness and cost of goods with flexible adaptability of their variety to change the consumer requirements. Increased operational benefits more than compensate for the increased cost of production technologies.

3. Are revolutionary changes in the system of production relations reduced to a radical restructuring of the economic mechanism or do they affect the basic structures of economic life? The question may be answered on philosophical grounds. Like any other form and content, such categories interact dialectically. Hegel himself noted that content means only a conversion of form and form a conversion of content.

As we radically restructure the economic mechanism, we inevitably change the entire system of relations, including its more profound strata. Conversely, changes in production relations under the influence of scientific and technical progress and shifts in production forces entail the need for the introduction of a new economic mechanism. All of its components assume not only external forms but a specific internal content (such as price and social value). The dividing line of interaction between content and form within a complex economic system is quite flexible and the connections between the two are both organically and dialectically conflicting. They are largely determined by the human factor, by the ability of people to manage on a contemporary scientific and technical and organizational level and efficiently to control them in the interest of society, the collective and the individual.

Today the efficiency problem is solved not on the basis of individual models of even the most advanced equipment but of integral technological systems which are revolutionizing the entire reproduction cycle. In converting enterprises to cost accounting the usual improvement of individual parts of the economic management system is ineffective. A radical reform is needed.

6. Full cost accounting is a live, a developing category. It is necessary, above all, to study real economic processes in order to understand its nature. Full cost accounting, which releases the initiative and interest of labor collectives, also increases risk and unpredictability, which could and should be promptly dealt with with the help of flexible planning control.

It would be erroneous to hope for an easy transition of enterprises, associations, sectors and the entire national economy to self-financing and self-support, as is frequently claimed by the mass information media. The very first steps in the new style of work adopted by enterprises of some union and republic ministries brought to light substantial difficulties and contradictions. Yet this is by no means full cost accounting. One of the problems is that in addition to some losing types of production, which require budget subsidies, there are large groups of underprofitable enterprises, which cannot acquire cost accounting funds needed for self-financing. Their share in the overall number of enterprises fluctuates (by year, sector and part of the country) between 30 and 50 percent.

Thus, in the UKSSR, in addition to the coal industry which "survives" on budget subsidies, in 1985 15 percent of communal economy enterprises, 26 percent of consumer service enterprises, 16 construction organizations and 12 percent of all sovkhoses in the republic worked at a loss, covered out of income taken from efficiently working collectives. Nor should we fail to mention the major and ever increasing state subsidies of meat and other foodstuffs. Even in the most profitable light industry sectors (with 35.8 percent profitability) and in the food industry (17.6 percent) the share of

losing and underprofitable enterprises without inner sources of self-financing consistent with planned development rates remains high.

Therefore, in order to ensure budgeted revenue, the financial authorities are forced to take the virtually entire profit of high-revenue areas, thus putting properly working enterprises in a difficult economic situation. This is a classical case of cutting off the limb of the tree on which we are sitting. Without a decisive conversion of all labor collectives to strict cost accounting the problem of surmounting loss and underprofitability and of increasing efficiency will not be solved. Each enterprise must reduce costs, and increase payments to the budget and to its own accumulation and consumption funds out of its own revenue.

According to estimates made by our institute, the normal operation of labor collectives on a cost accounting basis means that capital returns must not drop below 10 percent. It would be preferable to maintain this standard the 14-15 percent rate or, if possible, even higher. However, as a result of major shortcomings in controlling outlays and results on the level of enterprises and superior economic units (ruled by the principle that the plan must be fulfilled regardless of cost and imperfect price setting and financial-crediting systems) we cannot hope for any revolutionary changes in this indicator without making decisive changes in the very essence of the matter. There are no miracles in economic life.

Today our institute is studying the long-term trends of the shaping and dynamics of outlays, production costs, prices and profitability along the entire chain of sectors (from the extracting industry to the production of consumer goods). We have used the system of economic-mathematical modeling in forecasting such trends should we fail radically to change the current situation. Over the past 20 years a trend has developed of drastic increase in production costs which, starting with the very beginning--the extraction of raw material and fuels--spreads like a chain reaction, leading to an increase in the cost of intermediary and end products and goods.

The more or less stable level of cost accounting profitability is maintained, as a rule, only in sectors which manage to synchronize wholesale price increases with increased production costs at the proper time. Naturally, however, this only creates an illusion of stabilization and increased returns.

The price policy of the state, which allows flexible wholesale and purchase prices, is aimed at stabilizing retail prices. This leads to the following situation: the cost of some commodity groups, which is recovered through the intermediary operations of wholesale marketing, is not recovered in the final account by the direct consumers, for which reason it requires increasing budget subsidies. Meanwhile, in the case of many other commodities, end returns exceed the real value of the product as a result of artificially inflated prices.

In order somehow to reduce the negative aspects of differences in profitability, noneconomic "equalization" measures have to be taken, which consist not only of appropriating profits but also amortization withholdings from profitable sectors and enterprises (allocating them to losing and

underprofitable ones). This voids the value of cost accounting. Equalization "from above" undermines the interest of the best labor collectives in further increasing efficiency, for they know that any "surplus" will be appropriated. Meanwhile, those who, for many years on end, have been subsidized free of charge, have become accustomed to dependency and are not even trying to achieve high efficiency. Equalization has by no means surrendered its positions in intraeconomic relations as well.

Unquestionably, the prompt materialization of cost accounting funds and eliminating both the scarcity of individual commodities as well as the production of unnecessary items, which cause society tremendous economic harm, is a most important problem. An entirely paradoxical situation has developed: although the country has stockpiled commodity-material values which have reached the huge sum of 463 billion rubles, with an average annual increase of 25 billion, most enterprises are experiencing grave shortages of working capital. A considerable share of such reserve assets have long become unusable and their value will never be adequately recovered.

The purpose of the essentially new methods of socialist economic management, based on acknowledging the cost accounting nature of the state form of ownership, which comprehensively enhances the human factor, is to exclude such negative phenomena. No economic mechanism works automatically, by itself. We need highly productive and intensive work, improved through the professionalism of the personnel and their ability efficiently to organize the production and turnover processes.

The scientific concept of the new economic mechanism demands, first of all, a radical restructuring in the planning system. It is a question of achieving a dynamic structure in balancing and flexibility and a more efficient management of processes of outlays and results within each labor collective. Second, it requires a revision of the price policy and regulating prices on the basis of the requirements of full cost accounting and optimizing the interaction between prices and the financial-crediting system. Third, it requires the creation on this basis of stable and relatively equal economic conditions for cost accounting activities of labor collectives. Fourth, it calls for introducing stable long-term standards, above all in the area of budget and departmental payments, strictly guaranteeing a specific share of profits used in establishing cost accounting funds. Without this neither economic autonomy nor responsibility for decision-making are possible.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

COMBINING REGIONAL, SECTORIAL AND INDIVIDUAL INTERESTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 35-45

[Article by Valentin Karpovich Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom]

[Text] Solving the problem of converting the economy to a new qualitative standard requires not only taking broad steps in restructuring of the economic mechanism, implementing national programs for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress or taking other measures affecting the future of the entire national complex. Today the targets of individual regions and oblasts are being largely reformulated so that they may drastically increase their contribution to the acceleration of societal socioeconomic development. What directions are being followed by Moscow area party members in their search for contemporary approaches to this problem?

I

In formulating priorities, motive forces and sources of acceleration of the oblast's economic and social development, the party obkom proceeds from the stipulations of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum to the effect that restructuring means a decisive elimination of the obstructing mechanism, the drastic increase in the role of intensive factors for modernizing the economy, restoring and asserting within the national economy the Leninist principles of democratic centralism and comprehensively applying economic management methods. It is from such positions that we also approach the problem of developing Moscow Oblast, which is one of the largest administrative-territorial areas of the country, with a 6.5 million population, a powerful industrial and scientific and technical potential and a developed production and social infrastructure.

The oblast has about 11,000 labor collectives under the jurisdiction of more than 150 union, union-republic and republic ministries and departments. Its scientific institutions account for 6.9 percent of the scientific-teaching personnel of the Russian Federation. In terms of its average annual GNP Moscow Oblast is one of the six leading areas of the country.

Therefore, the oblast's national economic complex substantially affects the efficiency of the country's socioeconomic development. In recent years,

however, the growth rates of the oblast's economy had slowed down and the technical facilities of enterprises began increasingly to fall behind the demands of the time, particularly at machine building, textile and light industry enterprises. In the entire oblast industry, at the beginning of the present 5-year period, 25 percent of all machine tools were over 20 years old. The increased volume of output was achieved largely through extensive factors.

The development of the agrarian sector as well suffered from major shortcomings. Land was used inefficiently; capital returns were diminishing, production costs were rising and crop and livestock productivity remained low. Adverse changes were noted also in the ecological balance of the environment. Significant disproportions appeared in the development of industry and the social area.

It cannot be said that the oblast party organization had remained blind to such processes. However, no efficient steps were being taken to correct the situation. This was due to a variety of reasons, the most important of which were most frankly described at the January Plenum. In the majority of cases, the party members failed to display proper principle-mindedness. The responsibility of party committees for the pace and quality of such economic development had declined. This situation was aggravated by the problems which had accumulated in the country's economic mechanism.

Taking these situations into consideration, the task was set at the 26th Oblast Party Conference of surmounting negative trends and ensuring a significant acceleration in the growth rates of the economy and the social sphere. The conference demanded of the party obkcm, gorkoms and raykoms decisively to upgrade the efficiency of party members and the combat capability of all party organizations and to strengthen their ties with the masses, to raise the level of economic management and pay greater attention to the solution of basic problems of managing the national economic complex of the Moscow area. The importance of further improving territorial planning and economic management was particularly emphasized and so was that of optimally combining territorial with sectorial approaches in ensuring the comprehensive development of the oblast.

These tasks were concretized in the 5-year plan for the oblast's economic and social development. Let me mention a few of the most typical indicators: the planned growth rates for industrial output would be 50 percent higher than the annual average for the 11th 5-year period. Gross agricultural production would increase by nearly 15 percent; more than 3.3 billion rubles' worth of capital investments would go into the development of the nonproduction sphere. To this effect the local soviets would use substantial funds contributed by ministries and departments.

The directives on the formulation of the general plan for the development of Moscow and Moscow Oblast for the period until the year 2010 are of exceptional importance in ensuring the interrelated development of the oblast and the city; according to this plan the capital city and the oblast are considered a single national economic complex. The further development of the area must be based on intensive factors and efficient steps must be taken to limit population migration, moving out of the city and the oblast nonspecialized

production facilities, enterprises and scientific institutions and their deconcentration.

The implementation of this program of economic and social change inevitably demands new approaches to the organization of economic management. The party obkom and the oblast executive committee are increasingly focusing their attention on the long-term comprehensive and harmonious development of the area, the elimination of existing shortcuts and the improvement of territorial cooperation. That is why the planning and economic authorities began to apply more extensively the program-target method, which allows them to concentrate efforts and resources of local soviets and sectorial ministries on solving the main problems of accelerating the intensification of the oblast's economy while observing the strict priority of national interest. The planning authorities formulated target programs for the key areas of economic development, with the direct participation of party authorities and on the basis of creative cooperation with Moscow scientific centers, ministries and departments. These programs were: "Productivity," "Quality," "Resource Conservation," "Commodities and Services," "Health," "Culture and Sports," and "Housing." Together, they ensure a systematic acceleration of the pace and improved production efficiency and quality of output and development of the social sphere. Similar programs were formulated for all cities and rayons; the intersectorial nature of such programs is one of their specific features.

Typically, the program-target planning method most substantially changes the trend of the work of party organizations. Their activities are becoming increasingly less limited to their own enterprise or sector. The search for reserves in order to reach high end results for the national economic complex of the city, rayon and oblast, is broadening. The social significance of the labor contribution of individual collectives is increasing; the use of regional cost accounting in the economic mechanism establishes reliable links between territorial and union interests.

The question of labor resources is one of the gravest in the oblast. Its proper solution determines a number of key problems of economic and social development. The current scarcity of manpower is worsened by the fact that the size of the active-age population will be declining in the current and subsequent 5-year periods. The situation is also worsened by the increasing swing of manpower migrations from the oblast to the city. According to a one-time survey, every day several hundred thousand people commute to the city. Efforts to eliminate cadre shortages by recruiting manpower from other oblasts failed to yield expected results and aggravated social problems.

Taking into consideration the existing situation, the oblast party and soviet authorities decided drastically to curtail and, subsequently, halt the recruitment of workers from the outside and to meet the needs of the oblast with the available labor potential by skillfully developing systems for managing the oblast's labor resources. With the help of the USSR State Committee for Labor, such a system was formulated as part of the "Labor Resources" program and was approved by the Moscow City Party Buro and Moscow Oblast Executive Committee. Thus, on the basis of the new wage rates and salaries and making extensive use of collective contracting, the number of

workers in industry will be reduced by 44,400 and in science and scientific services by 11,100, as compared to 15,700 and 6,500 respectively, during the last 5-year period. The oblast has extensively used the experience of Novopolotsk in the BSSR, on keeping individual records of population employment.

Following the example of the people of Leningrad, we decided to upgrade the efficiency of utilization of the active share of productive capital by formulating a target program for converting industrial enterprises to multiple-shift work. This will enable us to write off more than 4,000 pieces of obsolete and unnecessary equipment. By the end of the 5-year plan the shift coefficient of metal processing equipment must reach 1.75 and that of highly productive equipment, 2.2. This year the oblast's entire industry will convert to a multiple-shift work system.

Steps were taken to improve capital construction. Three territorial construction associations were set up within the Glavmosoblstroy system, working on the basis of collective contracts. In the future they will be operating on the basis of full cost accounting, self-support and self-financing. Furthermore, a specialized association, Mosoblinzhstroy will be set up, which will perform sanitation engineering and electrical installation projects. The USSR Council of Ministers supported our suggestions on the creation of Agrostroy, an industrial construction and installation association. We are working on the creation of a wide oblast network of design-construction firms. Capital investments in the reconstruction and technical retooling of operating enterprises have been increased substantially.

Taking into consideration the errors which were made in the social development of the countryside, the oblast, party, soviet and economic authorities drafted an extensive program for its social restructuring. In addition to the reconstruction of the central farmsteads of sovkhozes and kolkhozes, a course was charted of renovation and, in many cases, restoration of so-called unpromising settlements which, only recently, seemed doomed to disappear. This 5-year period, through the joint efforts of sovkhozes, construction organizations and enterprises in Moscow City and oblast, 350 production centers will be set up. Last year alone 63 such centers were completed fully and 30 others partially.

The intensification of economic management methods presumes systematic improvements in monetary circulation in the oblast and balancing the population's income and expenditures. Based on the experience of Ulyanovsk and other oblasts, the local soviets are seeking possibilities of expanding paid population services and increasing the production of consumer goods. The 12th 5-Year Plan calls for increasing sales of foodstuffs and industrial commodities to the population by a factor of 1.4 and an increase in providing paid services by a factor of 1.7. All enterprises and organizations in the oblast are being included in this project. The soviets are now exercising more energetically their rights in the search for local opportunities for the production of consumer goods and for providing various types of paid services. This year, for example, by increasing the load of existing capacities, the Moscow Oblast soviet and the city and rayon soviets have issued to enterprises

under union and republic ministry jurisdiction assignments for the production of 200 million rubles' worth of commodities in greater demand. Furthermore, paid services to the population will exceed 900 million rubles, or a 34-percent increase over last year. The oblast has already set up more than 80 cooperatives producing consumer goods and working in public catering and services.

The oblast party committee tries to concentrate on problems of perfecting labor organization and wages. More than 93 percent of all construction organizations are working on the basis of collective contracts, used for the first time at Mosobltselstroy Trust No 18, and subsequently approved by the CPSU Central Committee. In agriculture about 60 percent of all workers in crop growing and approximately 70 percent of livestock breeders work on the basis of collective contracts. Family contracting is becoming increasingly widespread.

As we surmount stagnation and the inertia of obsolete approaches, we increasingly realize that cadres are the decisive factor in the successful updating of all aspects of our life. After the congress the party obkom firmly charted a course of supporting initiative-minded, thinking and energetic people, who can fight for new ideas, work actively, lead their collectives and achieve success. With the use of economic management methods the qualities of our experienced economic cadres and cadres who left their mark in the course of restructuring were revealed in a new light. N.F. Khripunov, director of the Minudobreniya Production Associations, A.P. Chubov, director of the Moscow Worsted Association, I.I. Kukhar, chairman of the kolkhoz imeni Vladimir Ilich, A.G. Kavetskiy, director of the Selskaya Nov Sovkhoz, N.I. Travkin, manager of Mosobltselstroy Trust No 18, Yu.B. Belokon, manager of Mosoblstroy Trust No 19 and others set a universal example. We shall persistently continue our search for talented managers and our efforts to strengthen their positions.

What was the result of these efforts? In 1986 the growth of industrial output exceeded the planned figures by a factor of 1.4; the volume of contractual underprocurements was reduced by one-half. The personnel of the agroindustrial complex fulfilled their assignments on sales to the state of basic types of crops and animal husbandry goods. Currently no sovkhoz or kolkhoz in the oblast is working at a loss. Total farm profits for 1986 exceeded 712 million rubles with an overall profitability of 33 percent.

The volume of fixed installed assets increased by 22 percent. The social program is being implemented and the plan for the commissioning of housing, schools, children's institutions, hospitals and polyclinics was fulfilled.

The oblast's economy is steadily developing this year as well. Planned assignments in industry were overfulfilled in the first quarter. Construction, transportation and service industry workers met their basic technical and economic indicators. Compared with last year, purchases in agriculture increased by 8 percent for milk and 4 percent for cattle and poultry. The productivity of the dairy herd increased by 45 kg. What makes these results noteworthy is that they were obtained essentially with the use

of intensive factors. The entire increase in output in the leading economic sectors was the result of higher labor productivity.

II

Nonetheless, as we sum up the results of work done after the congress, we must admit that not only positive trends have been developing but also that obstructing factors and forces of inertia have remained active. Changes have not reached the necessary depth and the trends of restructuring have only begun to show, and not in all collectives. The oblast's economy has significantly greater reserves which are by no means being used. All that we achieved has been essentially the result of better discipline, responsibility and organization. Reserves lying more deeply under the surface must be mastered.

In analyzing the course of restructuring, meeting with party members and labor collectives and considering problems at Moscow City Party Committee Buro meetings, we realize that many of the shortcomings which hinder the renovation process are largely due to major faults in the work of city and rayon party committees and primary party organizations. Unfortunately, many gorkoms and raykoms spend more time in talk about restructuring while in practice it is business as usual. In frequent cases the party apparatus assumes the functions of soviet and economic authorities instead of making a profound study of reasons for a negative phenomenon and determining the ways and means of eliminating old habits. This lowers the standards of party leadership in ideological and cadre work. This situation exists in Lukhovitskiy, Mytishchinskiy, Mozhayskiy and many other party gorkoms and raykoms. Such faults are being currently eliminated.

However, the party cadres must not lower their attention to economic problems. As the economic mechanism switches to a new track, such attention must be thoroughly increased. However, this must be done precisely by political methods and not by taking over from the economic authorities or engaging in their petty supervision.

One of the most important factors which hinders the full implementation of our plans is the disparity between existing management and organizational-economic relations and production forces. That is why the planned acceleration of socioeconomic development and increased economic intensification can be achieved by improving territorial management and properly combining it with sectorial management forms.

The 27th CPSU Congress called for increasing the responsibility of the local authorities for ensuring regional comprehensive economic and social development, the efficient use of the production and scientific potential, labor and fuel resources and the industrial and social infrastructure, and the satisfaction of population needs for consumer goods and services.

However, the practice of economic relations and the concentration and allocation of resources essentially on the basis of the sectorial principle hinder the full utilization of available territorial possibilities of upgrading public production efficiency and intensification, given the

imperfect nature of the mechanism of territorial management, and lead to the appearance of contradictions and disproportions in the economic area, which disturb planned labor cooperation and lower its effectiveness.

For example, supplying all oblast enterprises with goods and services for intersectorial use is one of the difficult problems. So far, as a result of departmental lack of coordination, enterprises are setting up their small-scale production facilities for the manufacturing of specialized equipment, tools, castings and nonstandard equipment. Thus, the oblast's industry has more than 130 shops and sections producing iron, steel and nonferrous castings, and 600 metal processing and 400 instrument-making shops. One-half of all machine building enterprises are producing castings, ingots and molds for their own use. Specialized repair enterprises account for no more than 15 percent of all repair work. Compared with specialized enterprises, the manufacturing cost of items for intersectorial use at nonspecialized enterprises is higher by a factor of 1.2-2; labor productivity is lower by a factor of 2-2.5 and metal expenditures are higher by 15-20 percent.

Considerable opportunities are created with the better utilization of basic production capital. The sectorial organization of economic management prevents us from making full use of highly productive equipment, robots and automatic machines in particular. For example, according to statistical studies made last year, more than 8,000 units or 13 percent of all installed metal processing equipment in basic production facilities remained idle, 40 percent of it due to lack of personnel and work.

Let us consider the use of recycled resources and production waste, which amount to about 60 million tons per year. They are collected and partially processed by several functional subdivisions of the USSR Gosnab, Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, State Committee for Petroleum Products, Tsentrsoyuz and other ministries and departments, whose activities are virtually uncoordinated. For this and other reasons less than one-third of the total waste is recycled. According to the specialists, the creation of a single territorial system for the use of secondary resources would enable us, as early as the 12th 5-year period, to double the volume of their utilization and save primary raw and other materials worth 1.3 billion rubles. Equally eloquent examples can be cited pertaining to the waste of forces and funds in the production of consumer goods, the organization of the transportation system, the organization and functioning of the housing-communal economy and many other economic areas. A departmental approach predominated until recently even in the management of the local economy. Local industry enterprises operating on the oblast's territory are under the jurisdiction of three independent oblast administrations.

Regardless of differences among situations, all of them confirm the imperfect nature of the organizational and economic mechanism of oblast economic management. We can see in practice the validity of V.I. Lenin's warning that the lack of coordinated work among different departments on a local basis is one of the worst evils which blocks economic construction, and the great need for constant coordination and elimination of friction, red tape, departmental narrow-mindedness and formalism.

The party authorities are frequently forced to assume coordinating functions in solving difficult problems of territorial economic management. Economic results are achieved. However, almost inevitably this violates the principle of separating party from economic management functions and lowers the attention which the party agencies must pay to cadre, ideological and organizational work. What can and must be done to counter this customary yet obviously obsolete approach?

The study of specific practical experience indicates that a qualitatively new target of territorial management has appeared, which includes regional output and production and social infrastructure, and the organization of territorial economic complexes. This target acts as a common base for the functioning of the oblast's territorial economic complex and greatly influences its efficiency. It calls for the creation of a respective territorial economic management system.

Of late economic functions which can be efficiently implemented only with the correct combination of the sectorial with territorial approach on the basis of economic methods, which include cost accounting, self-support and self-financing, are being increasingly entrusted to the local soviets. Under our oblast's conditions the decision of the executive authorities to increase the rights of the oblast planning commission by allowing it to deal with problems previously under the jurisdiction of the USSR and RSFSR Gosplans played an important role in harnessing the reserves of the territorial approach and increasing the influence of party, soviet and economic authorities in ensuring the economically and socially interrelated development of the territory. As a whole, the Moscow Oblast Planning Commission is now supplying materials to 19 cities, 39 rayons, 102 union and union-republic and 49 republic ministries.

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures to Upgrade Further the Role and Increase the Responsibility of Soviets of People's Deputies in Accelerating Socioeconomic Development in the Light of the Resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress" was a new major step in this area. The decree expanded the range of influence of local soviets, provided major opportunities for stimulating local initiative and substantially increased the rights of the local soviets in ensuring the harmonious and interrelated development of the regional economy and its sociocultural area.

Guided by this document, in solving the broad problems of economic and social development, the local soviets began to rely with increased frequency on the labor collectives and the deputy aktivs in solving the broad problems of economic and social development, and to take into consideration the views of the population. More extensively than ever before, at their sessions the soviets analyze problems of economic development, acceleration of scientific and technical progress, fuller utilization of the available potential and improvements in the working, living and recreation conditions of the people. Sessions of Soviet authorities and their executive committees are held in different places. This enables the deputies to study more thoroughly existing problems and to make specific suggestions on how to improve matters in one work sector or another. The permanent commissions are participating more actively in preparing for such sessions and executive committee meetings.

They draft reports and resolutions and participate in the implementation of the plans.

Nonetheless, the local soviets must reorganize the work of their apparatus faster and assume more daringly responsibility for the comprehensive development of the territory and for satisfying the needs of the population. This calls for backing the activities of soviet authorities with new laws which will give local soviets economic control over relations among sectors and territories and would enhance their real interest in ensuring the efficient operation of the entire oblast economic complex on an equal partnership basis. The point is that today the local soviets do not have sufficiently strong economic and organizational means of implementing their functions and exercising their rights in all areas of their activities.

For example, the formulation of a territorial plan for broadening the functions of the Moscow Oblast Planning Commission proved insufficient in ensuring the full implementation of tasks related to the comprehensive development of the oblast because of unsolved method, procedural and legal problems. Nor does the plan formulation mechanism itself meet this requirement. The structure of its indicators has a clearly expressed sectorial nature. Adequate discipline is lacking in relations between the planning commissions of local soviets and ministries and departments. Ministerial projects submitted to the local planning authorities are directed toward meeting sectorial rather than territorial interests. Furthermore, as a rule, such projects are being issued to the enterprises with some indicator changes.

Consequently, currently several simultaneous plans are in effect in the oblast, approved by the USSR and RSFSR Councils of Ministers and the Moscow Oblast Executive Committee, as well as a plan based on indicators issued by ministries and departments for use by enterprises and organizations operating in the Moscow area. Significant disparities exist among all such plans. Let me cite two indicators only. The 1986 Moscow Oblast Executive Committee plan approved a growth rate in the volume of industrial output by 2.9 percent; according to the plans which ministries have issued to the enterprises, the growth rates do not exceed 2.7 percent.

That is precisely why it is a question not simply of broadening the rights and responsibilities of the local soviets in economic building but also of creating an efficient mechanism for territorial planning and economic management.

III

The question is how to increase the contribution of the area to the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development? Past experience convincingly proves that scientists and practical workers who reduced the harnessing of territorial production reserves only to broadening the rights and improving the work of local soviets were wrong. In our view, this must be based on the instruction formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress on creating complexes of interrelated sectors, scientific and technical centers and various forms of economic associations and territorial-production units.

Noteworthy in this connection is the suggestion of setting up independent territorial economic authorities.

This problem becomes very relevant under the conditions of the conversion of enterprises in many sectors (and, in the future, in all sectors) to self-support, self-financing and various forms of full cost accounting. The enterprises are thus given the opportunity of setting up, based on the results of their work, substantial funds for their technical and social development. Their efficient utilization mandatorily presumes not only sectorial but also territorial forms of participation in distribution. This applies to perfecting the industrial infrastructure and, to an even greater extent, to the social development funds. Increasing the funds of the labor collectives, strengthening the principles of self-government in their activities and freeing enterprises from daily centralized management and petty supervision greatly change the situation. From petitioners, a role which territorial authorities were frequently forced to play, they become organizers of the efficient utilization of resources available in their specific area.

Based on such processes, at the 27th CPSU Congress the Moscow Oblast party organizations submitted a suggestion on the need to set up, in addition to sectorial union and union-republic ministries and departments, territorial associations in charge of intersectorial production. Such associations would manage existing enterprises whose output has mass intersectorial use, repair plants, communal economy enterprises and local industry. It would be expedient within such a production structure to concentrate and develop recycling enterprises. It would also include regional scientific and production centers which would make it possible for the most advanced technology—laser, plasma, and powder—to become accessible to any regional enterprise on a contractual basis. The USSR Academy of Sciences, CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov and other leading scientific centers were asked to participate in work on such problems. The formulated suggestions were approved by the scientific public and supported by the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The oblast already has two territorial economic authorities of this type: one in charge of consumer services and housing, and another for the urban economy. It is on the basis of such principles that the management of intersectorial production facilities and local industry will be organized.

The question of whether or not there should be a single territorial authority depends on the specific scale of the administered project. In the case of Moscow Oblast a single authority would be excessively cumbersome. For that reason we are considering new management units which would supplement the already extant Moscow Oblast agroprom to which, subsequently, unified management authorities in charge of the construction and transportation systems could be added.

In our view, the system of territorial economic authorities could be structured as follows: management agencies operating on a cost accounting basis; systems of program-target agencies; and various associations working on a cooperative basis.

Particularly noteworthy among such territorial formations are agencies in charge of managing territorial production-economic complexes. The interesting suggestion was made of setting up a Moscow Oblast Inter-Economic Production Association (MOMPO). The basic task of such an association would be to ensure the efficient intersectorial territorial integration of the national economy in Moscow Oblast in optimizing the use of scientific and technical and production potential, developing the overall production infrastructure, producing consumer goods and making use of secondary resources and industry by-products.

In the first stage, the association would assume direct jurisdiction over local industry enterprises and organizations in producing items of intersectorial use and working essentially to meet the needs of the oblast, currently under the jurisdiction of different ministries, and over organizations engaged in gathering and processing secondary resources and production waste.

The establishment of the MOMPO would require the transfer of enterprises which are currently under double jurisdiction (republic ministry and Moscow Oblast Executive Committee) under the single jurisdiction of the new authority. All in all, about 100 enterprises and organizations employing about 40,000 people and providing goods and services worth more than 500 million rubles would be affected. As the experiment develops and the MOMPO gains experience, it would broaden its range of influence.

The fact that such a type of territorial organ would function on the principles of cost accounting, self-support and self-financing would be of essential significance. The MOMPO resources would be provided mainly by juridically autonomous cost accounting enterprises and organizations under its management.

A major feature of the MOMPO (unlike sectorial authorities) would be that it would acquire a significant portion of its resources from enterprises under union and union-republic jurisdiction, for purposes of solving common production and social problems. To this effect the association would set up various organizations which would provide commission services for making fuller use of one-of-a-kind equipment and intersectorial engineering centers. It would coordinate the production of consumer goods and services including those produced on the basis of individual labor activity and by cooperatives.

The creation of territorial economic agencies will be based on maximal management democratization. For example, self-governing authorities will operate at the enterprises and at the MOMPO itself, as enterprise and association councils. Managements on all levels will be elected on a competitive basis. However, territorial economic authorities cannot be set up without conversion to full cost accounting, for without it they would inevitably turn into simply one more administrative agency.

The organization of territorial economic authorities will require a new system of planning and the development of corresponding resource procurement methods. In our view, it would be proper for the material resources and capital investments to be treated as a separate item in the appropriations for the

Moscow Oblast Executive Committee. In turn, the committee would apportion such funds among territorial economic units.

The restructuring of territorial economic management presumes changes in the internal structure of the oblast's economic complex. In particular, changes on the oblast level should be combined with steps taken on the rayon and city management level, the role of which increases under contemporary conditions with the creation and strengthening of various types of local territorial economic units.

The establishment of territorial economic management authorities under the aegis of the local soviets, combined with the extensive development of self-government, self-financing and self-support on the level of the primary production unit will create prerequisites for converting the economy of the entire territory of Moscow Oblast to the application of such principles. At the same time, the transfer of a number of important functions related to the comprehensive development of the economy to the local authorities, based on the use of the regional form of cost accounting, will require further improvements in the organizational structure of the party apparatus and qualitative changes in the approach to the solution of economic problems. As the territorial economic management organs are established and as the role of soviets in economic construction is enhanced, the efforts of the party committees must become increasingly focused on the profound study of economic and social processes and the situation in the primary party organizations, the development of the creative activeness of the working people, the setting of priorities in regional economics, the selection, placement and training of cadres and control and verification of execution.

The initial steps in this direction have already been taken. The increased role of economic management methods, the need for choosing scientific ways of oblast economic development and ensuring the coordinated and flexible work of the sectorial departments of the party obkom have made it necessary to introduce the position of Moscow City Party Committee secretary in charge of economic affairs. The obkom buro also decided to increase the personnel of the economic department by reducing it in a number of sectorial departments. A sector dealing with economic analysis and perfecting territorial planning and management was set up within the economic department.

Naturally, there will be difficulties; nor are we guaranteed against errors. It is only day-to-day practice and specific experience that will enable us to draw final conclusions on the accuracy of administrative decisions. The main thing now is not to stay idle but to advance purposefully, steadily improving the economic mechanism on the basis of the experience acquired in the country, decisively eliminating all that is useless and obsolete.

Nonetheless, it is clear now that the setting up of territorial economic management authorities under the Moscow Oblast Executive Committee will make the exercise of the rights granted the local soviets in economic and sociocultural construction possible. It is not a question of curbing sectorial management but of freeing it from extraneous functions, for essentially it will be dealing with problems of intersectorial nature which, in frequent cases, have remained outside the scope of economic management.

The party members in the Moscow area have adopted an entirely responsible attitude toward the experiment also because its results are of interest not to Moscow Oblast alone. We are relying in our work on the active assistance of the USSR and RSFSR Gosplans, sectorial ministries and departments. As the statements by party members and nonparty comrades in the local areas and the results of sociological surveys, the party obkom mail and our meetings and discussions with primary party organizations indicate, the suggested new developments will be part of organizational and economic steps which can yield fast and tangible results.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

PARTY WORK AND EDUCATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) p 46

[Letter to the editors by V. Shirshov, senior teacher, Sverdlovsk Pedagogical Institute, candidate of pedagogical sciences]

[Text] In my opinion we cannot accelerate restructuring in party work without extensive use of the recommendations of pedagogical science. V.I. Lenin had pointed out the direct link between party work and education: "A certain element of pedagogy will always be present in the political activities of the social democratic party..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 10, p 357). We believe that such interpenetration becomes particularly important today, when no single major problem can be solved without harnessing man's best qualities.

Paradoxically, under the conditions of restructuring and accelerated scientific and technical progress, democratization is clearly insufficient as an effective means of developing communist activeness. Economic activities are being restructured much more noticeably and rapidly, whereas party, trade union and Komsomol work remains behind. Basic organizational methods of party work, such as meetings and conferences frequently become hindrances to the further intensification of intraparty democracy. Yet today many party organizations have already formulated and tested progressive approaches. The initial results of the new experience have become apparent. However, we have been only partially successful in triggering a broad response and enthusiasm among the people. Why is this?

In my view, the main complexity in surmounting stereotypes here is the existence of a traditional and by no means always accurate practice of considering that all communists are potentially good people and excellent workers. This occasionally leads to the conclusion that it is simply unnecessary to influence people. Actually, some of us live and work by no means according to the high standards of party ethics. For that reason we must formulate criteria for a differentiated approach in assessing the personal qualities of party members with the help of psychological and pedagogical methods. We must shift the emphasis from "everything is all right" and "only the positive" to a discussion of the true state of affairs, for the educational principle of "on the basis of what is positive" in

upbringing demands that we take into consideration both the good and the base in the activities of specific individuals.

Today new features have appeared in the activities of most party organizations. For example, before a meeting draft decrees and the necessary "food for thought" are issued to the members. "Free microphones" are set up in the hall. However, these are merely the initial steps in restructuring party work. In order to adopt new features we need not only an active interaction with the audience, which may number dozens or hundreds of people, but also the broader use of suitably proven educational methods for the study of individuals.

For example, in order to define the qualitative standard of activities of a given party member and to assess his ideological, moral and practical characteristics, quick assessments could become part of the method of combining separate features, along with sociometric and quantitative methods. The same system could be efficiently used to analyze the interrelationship among party members (it is no secret to anyone that today they are noted only on the level of interpersonality conflicts and cases of violation of party ethics).

As practical experience indicates, mass written surveys substantially add to information on the aspirations of the individuals and their moral stance. To many work on their answers becomes an incentive for active thinking and the summed up information provided by the surveys lead to practical accomplishments. Therefore, surveys of various types must become a regular feature not only in defining tasks and combining personal experience and views of party members but also determining the level of their theoretical and practical knowledge. I believe that the active use of this and other psychological and pedagogical methods will increase interest in theory and become a base for new scientific and methodical studies of problems of restructuring in all areas of activity of Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE OR DESIGN BUREAU?

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) p 47

[Letter to the editors by Yu. Belyayev, candidate of technical sciences, docent, Moscow Engineering-Construction Institute imeni V.V. Kuybyshev]

[Text] In my opinion, many sectorial scientific research institutes are actual design or technological bureaus judging by the nature of their work and the qualifications of their personnel. In frequent cases the studies which lead to the development of new equipment and technology are such that they cannot be classified as scientific work. These are essentially ordinary "regulation" tests of prototypes, to establish "what happened." They do not lead to the discovery of previously unknown general laws which could bring about essential technical improvements.

In some cases such "studies" consist of nothing but mathematical equations, formulas and diagrams unrelated to new technology. However, equipment or technology prototypes added to such "research" are presented as application results. At that point, even the strictest opponents or reviewers are no longer feared: who would dare to object a study which, although still "hot" has already been applied and has yielded economic result?

The following question arises: Why is it that aerospace equipment is developed in design bureaus while rolling mills or construction machinery are designed by scientific research institutes? This lowers the responsibility of the performers in developing new equipment, for the basic output of a scientific research institute, as its name indicates, is that of conducting scientific studies. Furthermore, the status of a member of an institution known as a scientific research institute makes it incumbent upon him to apply "his" results which, as a rule, are not all that numerous and whose quality is not always of a suitable level.

In his work a designer or technologist must combine accomplishments in a number of scientific areas, practical experience and the needs of society. Anything else that may be demanded of him makes no sense. The duties of a researcher are equally labor intensive, complex and responsible. For that reason, neither should be compared to Pushkin's Balda, who would "boil and peel his own egg."

In this connection, I believe that sectorial scientific research institutes, which deal essentially with design and technology should be reorganized as design and technological bureaus. Some of their associates, who are engaged in research and have proper qualifications and experience for such purposes should be assigned to autonomous nondepartmental scientific research institutions (laboratories, scientific research institutes), for the physical-mechanical processes of technical projects which they must study should not be classified on a departmental basis.

Designers and technologists will no longer have to present their developments as scientific research. Some other actions related to the formal status of scientific research institute personnel will become equally unnecessary.

The main form of works submitted in the pursuit of scientific degrees by personnel of design and technological bureaus should be descriptions of basic features in the prototypes of new equipment they have developed. Such type of dissertations which, incidentally, is stipulated in the regulation on the procedure for awarding scientific degrees and scientific titles but rarely practiced will indicate the level of information of the author regarding scientific research related to the developed new equipment and the ability to put to practical use the results of scientific research.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

THE ARTIST AND INDUSTRY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 47-48

[Letter to the editors by I. Seredyuk, rector, Lvov State Institute of Applied and Decorative Art]

[Text] In my opinion, the initial step in the struggle for consumer good quality is ignored: the creation of fashionable, highly aesthetic and competitive models and prototypes for use by industry. In order for light industry to produce commodities with such features and for such items to be made available to the consumer, naturally, we need modern high-efficiency technological lines, high-quality raw materials and progressive trading methods. However, this is insufficient, for the following question remains: What to manufacture? Who should manufacture highly artistic prototypes for industry? Here a contribution must be made by the collectives of higher applied schools, oriented toward industrial use.

The use of student and faculty collectives of higher art institutions as practical workers is necessary from several viewpoints. Let us bear in mind, above all, that the foundations for ensuring the necessary quality of consumer goods should be laid in the school, on an anticipatory basis. The VUZs must direct their students to the search for promising solutions pertaining not only to the present but also to the future and work in close contact with industry, thus becoming centers for continuing training and upgrading the skill of specialists. In most cases adequate material facilities exist to this effect ensuring the manufacturing of experimental industrial prototypes, experimenting, etc.

Thus, we have in our Lvov Institute of Applied and Decorative Art a glass-foundry which works on a year-round basis, furnaces for firing ceramic items, clothing and weaving workshops, and a carpentry shop. From the sale of glass items the institute earns 150,000 rubles annually. The members of the Prestizh Youth Association make prototypes of fashionable youth clothing. Such clothing is produced in small series by the students of tailoring schools in the city and sold by the youth store. We are planning to expand the activities of our creative collectives in these areas.

We have concluded a contract for cooperation with USSR Ministry of Light Industry. The ministry provides us with equipment, a share of our

construction funds, etc. In particular, we believe that subunits, such as a quality control laboratory for artistic goods, a design bureau for preparations for the manufacturing of items (and groups of economic analysis and technical documentation) a laboratory for the study and forecast of demand and a department for the dissemination of frontranking experience and upgrading skills are necessary. All of this will yield beneficial results.

Integration between higher schools and industry could be fruitful. For example, our VUZ trains specialists in virtually all most important light industry areas. This includes the modeling of clothing, shoes, headgear, knitted goods, artistic fabrics, printed or woven, artistic glass and ceramics, and furniture and interior designing. Therefore, based on our possibilities, our contribution to aesthetics in these areas could and should be more substantial.

Legalizing the tasks set to art VUZs would help them in their economic activities (which, in the view of Ministry of Finance personnel are not always legislated) and give them full partnership status with industry in the struggle for quality. The recognition of the active role which applied-art VUZs play in developing varieties of consumer goods would enhance the prestige of artists in this area, for they are sometimes considered to be one degree lower than artists and, sometimes, not artists at all. It is entirely obvious, however, that the time has come to recognize that one of the most important ways leading to a radical improvement in the aesthetic qualities of consumer goods is the more extensive use of the creative potential of artists working in the applied and decorative arts.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

SELF-GOVERNMENT AND CENTRALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 49-52

[Article by Aleksandr Alekseyevich Bulyanda, director of the Azovstal Metallurgical Combine imeni Sergo Ordzhonikidze in Zhdanov]

[Text] In codifying the new economic management methods, the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) includes a number of essential approaches which radically change the system of national economic management in the spirit of the reconstruction taking place in the country. Nonetheless, as the thorough study of the draft and its extensive discussion by labor collectives indicate, a number of stipulations in this document must be developed further. Some of them, in my view, are simply unacceptable.

I am convinced that restructuring the economic mechanism is simply impossible without a real expansion of enterprise rights and a decisive rejection of the morally obsolete planning practice which encourages the fulfillment of the plan at all costs, fetters the initiative of labor collectives through numerous planning and evaluation indicators, norms, standards and ceilings, and suppresses socialist enterprise. For the third consecutive year the Azovstal collective has been working under the new economic management conditions. However, despite the familiar CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees, we continue to receive from superior organizations a huge amount of indicators the number of which has been even increasing. The plan for the production of industrial commodities, which was issued to the combine for 1987 by the UkSSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, has 59 items over and above economic and financial indicators. In addition to stipulating the volumes of output of basic commodities, they include assignments for the production of castings for our own needs, smelting operations and activities (remember that this is a metallurgical combine!) such as the production of lumber, some of which used in railroad car manufacturing (which means that we must repair railroad cars ourselves), rebuilding parts for tractors and even use of industrial shavings for the production of pressed-wood tiles. All such projects are broken down by quarter and are mandatory! Who needs such planning? Even under the sovnarkhozes no such thing existed. I believe that the new law must stop such faulty practices. The 5-year plan must include control figures for finished products only (in the case of metallurgical enterprises, finished rolled pieces); as to the amounts of pig iron and steel of various brands to be

smelted, the enterprise would set its own figures, based on its production possibilities and in accordance with state orders and economic expediency.

The number of economic standards as well should be reduced to a minimum. Since we are speaking of full cost accounting, self-financing and self-support, why should the ministry decide what funds should be set aside for material incentive, for technical retooling and for the solution of social problems? It seems to me that the enterprise should be issued only two indicators: withholdings from profits for payments to the budget and payments to the higher authority. The collective should have the right to use as it wishes the profit left to the enterprise, naturally based on the principle of social justice. This approach is entirely consistent with Point 3 of Article 2 of the draft law, which stipulates that "as the full master of the enterprise, the labor collective independently solves all problems of production and social development." This should be the basis of the planning system. I therefore deem necessary that the words "in accordance with the control figures....," be followed by the following, to be added to Point 1 of said article: "for the production of the basic types of finished commodities."

The stipulation in the draft law on setting up at the enterprise a wage fund which would combine the funds for wages and material incentive and would be the only source for paying workers, based on labor results is rather contentious. Such a combination of funds, assuming that it is not nominal or purely automatic (which would make no sense whatsoever) conflicts with the very idea of material incentive for achieving the highest possible end results and with several CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decrees on problems of perfecting the economic mechanism. For example, fines, the payment for which, according to said decrees, will come out of the material incentive fund, may exceed the amount of the share of the unified wage fund used for bonuses. Such fines will have to come from the salaries and wages of the personnel. This situation cannot be economically justified, for which reason the last paragraph of Point 2, Article 3 of the draft law, should be deleted.

Speaking of wages, let us note some contradictions between Article 11, which deals with scientific and technical progress and upgrading quality, and Point 4 of Article 14. The law grants extensive opportunities to the enterprise for steadily upgrading the technical standard and organization of output, perfecting technological processes, improving the quality of output while, at the same time, strengthening the responsibility of labor collectives for the situation in these areas. This is quite important, for it is only on the basis of the extensive use of the latest scientific and technical achievements in production that efficient and profitable work is possible today. However, the successful solution of such problems depends, to a determining extent, on the professional skill of the administrative apparatus of the enterprise and its ability to solve completely not only daily but long-term and frequently difficult problems. This requires granting the collective total freedom in determining the number of workers in its individual departments and services and their wages. However, Point 4 of Article 14 here as well strictly limits the enterprise. Furthermore, it makes it mandatory steadily to lower administrative costs. There are no reasons to fear any "inflation" in the

size of administrative personnel under self-financing conditions. Restructuring the wage system of managerial personnel is a different matter, particularly in the case of those who directly determine the use of new equipment and progressive technology and not only the end results of the work of the entire collective but also the specific contribution of the individual specialist, based on his official duties. Such a system will in itself lead to an optimal structure and size of managerial personnel, which will be necessary and sufficient to ensure the normal functioning of the enterprise. This too should be noted in the law.

The draft law pays great attention to upgrading the responsibility of enterprise managers for the results of the work of their collectives. Unquestionably, the enterprise manager must assume full responsibility for everything. However, I consider entirely inappropriate the fact that essentially the draft law does not mention the responsibility of other performers--middle-level managers, foremen and brigade leaders and rank-and-file workers. In this sense, it conflicts with previous party and government resolutions and with another most important legal document--the Law on Labor Collectives. I believe that Article 6 should be expanded by adding to it the clear stipulation that all enterprise personnel are responsible for implementing their obligations, from the director to the worker.

The following question arises: Do we need two quite similar documents? I believe that they should be combined within a single one, thus eliminating duplication and mutual contradictions.

Furthermore, the draft law under discussion defines the main way of exercising the rights of the labor collective, which is the general assembly (conference) and its executive authority, the labor collective council. This is a very essential feature.

The reason is that the enterprises have their trade union organizations, whose highest authority as well is the general meeting (conference) at which they elect their executive authority--the trade union committee. The functions, rights and obligations of trade union authorities, as codified in the bylaws of the trade unions, are the same as those of the labor collective council.

Here we have something in the nature of twin power. That is why we must set up within the collective a single authority or else (in the opposite case) clearly demarcate between their functions. For example, the labor collective's council could handle production, and the trade union committee, social problems. This would eliminate duplication in the work. We have more than enough organizations and authorities of all kinds, most of which, in addition to their other functions, have been given control rights. The establishment of yet another controlling authority, I believe, will not improve the situation. At the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, M.S. Gorbachev justifiably spoke of the investigations conducted by such authorities, "which today are pouring down literally like an avalanche on the enterprises,...diverting the people from and creating stress in the work. As a rule, the practical use of such investigations is minute." Clearly, the time has come to bring order in this matter and find a way of coordinating the

activities of controlling organizations. Such experience has been acquired in Leningrad and something in the same area has been accomplished in Zhdanov.

The Law on the State Enterprise (Association) is a long-term step. It must take into consideration the objective trends of social development. It must be clear and interpret various situations simply, leaving no loopholes which would subsequently necessitate various interpretations and instructions which, if not eliminating democratization in economic management, could lead it back into the ruts of bureaucratic centralism.

That is why the process of restructuring should affect above all and most decisively the higher levels of management—the Gosplan, the Ministry of Finance and the other ministries. For it is essentially especially due to the inertia and conservatism of the personnel of such authorities that the economic reform which was promulgated at the September 1965 CPSU Central Committee Plenum was not implemented, although many of the revolutionary changes which are currently being made in our economy were scheduled for implementation 20 years ago.

Finally, speaking of reconstruction in the economy and in all areas of our life, the following should also be mentioned: the process of perfecting production relations cannot be limited merely to the labor collective, for shaping the attitude of the individual toward labor and the needs of society is also accomplished in the family, the school and all other social areas.

Therefore, in taking decisive steps to strengthen economic relations, we must pay equal attention to the formulation and implementation of steps aimed at radically restructuring the consciousness of the people. This is a very important matter without the solution of which we cannot implement the great plans which the 27th CPSU Congress set the party and the entire Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

PERFECTING THE ECONOMIC COMPETITION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 52-54

[Article by Petr Vladimirovich Grechishnikov, scientific secretary, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] The draft USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) notes that under the new economic management conditions "the role of the economic competition among enterprises is enhanced as the most important form of socialist competition for the fullest possible satisfaction of consumer demand for efficient high-quality and competitive goods (work, services) with the lowest possible outlays (Article 2). The practical development of true economic competition among enterprises presumes, above all, the reinterpretation of existing practices and the deletion of obsolete ways and means of organization of the competition, which are inconsistent with the problems of comprehensive democratization of economic life which are solved in the course of restructuring.

We must begin by eliminating the "gross-output approach," which developed over a long period of time, and according to which the main objective of the competitors was to overfulfill the annual plan in terms of volume. Managers frequently tried to conceal available resources and to have their plans reduced. This made "winning" easier. An endless flood of victorious reports reached the superior organizations. New "greater" pledges were made, high-sounding appeals were formulated and competition on paper and by slogans gathered strength. Year after year the tasks of the competition were simplified and the competition itself became formal. The result was a situation in which the specific forms of socialist competition which, essentially, is the most important advantage of our economic system, hindered the implementation of another of its basic advantages—planned development.

Theoretical analysis as well as economic practice confirm that the efficiency of competition and planning are increased as a result of their close integration with each other. Since the competition is not a separate area of the economic mechanism but imbues all of its parts, it is called upon to ensure planning in economic development and to make it stronger. In this connection, the stipulation of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee "On the All-Union Socialist Competition for the Successful Implementation of the Assignments of the 12th

5-Year Plan" concerning the need to ensure the all-round economic substantiation of socialist obligations becomes particularly important. Such obligations "must become the most important instrument in formulating intensive plans." The practical implementation of this requirement will mean a radical elimination of the remaining "technology" in organizing the competition, for now the formulation of obligations must take place not after the annual plans have been approved but during the period of their drafting. Understandably, the "authoritativeness" of obligations related to accelerating socioeconomic development increases drastically. It is under this situation that conditions are created for combining the initiative of the masses, "from below," with centralized planning. It is a question of implementing that aspect of the economic role of the competition which involves cooperation in formulating a plan which would maximally encompass all reserves and possibilities and its successful implementation at the lowest possible cost.

The most important problem is the identification of reserves and possibilities for competing on different economic management levels. The nature of the competition is not manifested identically within the individual enterprise and in the interaction among labor collectives and basic economic units.

In direct relations between enterprise workers, in addition to its economic function, the competition clearly expresses social and educational functions (increased level of participation by the working people in production management, developed attitude toward labor, etc.). It is precisely this that predetermines the need, in summing up the results of the competition for the individual worker categories, to apply not only strictly economic indicators but also indicators which reflect social and educational effects. The fact that such competition takes place in the course of direct labor contacts has led many scientists conventionally to describe it as "labor competition."

A different situation prevails in the interaction among enterprise labor collectives. On this level the functioning of the nationwide cooperation of labor is manifested most fully and tangibly precisely as an economic function of the competition, for it is only on this economic management level that the end results of activities of production collectives are subjected to a "social test," for they reflect the efficiency of public production. Commodities they have produced are assessed from the viewpoint of their ability to meet most economically (based on ONZT criterion) specific social requirements. That is why the competition, without losing its natural--labor--base, assumes a specifically "economic" nature. It is precisely in relation to organizing the competition among socialist enterprises that V.I. Lenin used this term. Pointing out that the Soviet system had abolished commercial secrecy which protect private capitalist property, he emphasized that "...so far we have done virtually nothing to ensure openness in the targets of economic competition" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 191).

What is the nature of the economic competition among socialist enterprises?

In his speech at the 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions, M.S. Gorbachev noted the need "to redirect the system of socialist competition toward indicators such as quality, resource conservation and strict implementation of contractual deliveries. Those are the three foundations on which the

socialist competition must be based above all." Consequently, the main feature is the struggle for timely production of goods with highest world standards with minimal labor and material outlays.

That is why we must firmly reject the large number of currently existing artificial indicators of competition among enterprises (some of which are not directly related to it, such as the "condition of civil defense," "work of voluntary people's units," etc.), and limit ourselves to three or four indicators, which would include increasing the share of superior quality goods, increased labor productivity, and basic criteria in the conservation of material resources (lowering capital and material-intensiveness of output). It is precisely such indicators that will direct the efforts of the competitors toward the basic problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress and, in our view, should be reflected in the Law on the State Enterprise as indicators for summing up competition results.

In our view, establishing mandatory conditions without which the enterprise's collective can not be classified among the winners (such as 100 percent implementation of state orders and contractual delivery obligations, ensuring the stipulated correlation between the growth of labor productivity and wages, and so on) and the standards which must be met in competition indicators would contribute to improving the efficiency of the competition.

For example, it has been scientifically confirmed that today it is entirely realistic to require that a certain percentage of conservation be reached in order to meet the needs for fuel, energy, raw materials, metal and other materials. This standard could be used as a criterion. Consequently, it is not simply a question of improving a given indicator but of reaching a strictly stipulated level of such an indicator within the given planned period, which would be the base for determining the competition winners. The winner will be the enterprise which, having exceeded the stipulated level, has achieved the highest result. In other words, the rating should be based not on the previous "average achieved level" but the extent to which the enterprise has come closer to world standards or has exceeded them.

Fewer criteria would become an incentive in enhancing competitiveness in solving problems of acceleration and restructuring. Naturally, the number of competition winners would drop sharply. However, the possibility of being "rated," or being awarded a banner, order, etc., as a result of a beautifully drafted report, ostentation and figure padding would be excluded.

The organization of real economic competition among enterprises presumes the fuller utilization of commodity-monetary relations. The general trends in this area have been defined by the party in connection with the substantiation of the overall concept of the new economic mechanism. This includes the conversion of enterprises to full cost accounting and self-financing, and drastically enhances the importance of economic management methods. In this case streamlining the wage system plays a most important role.

During the 12th 5-year period upgrading wage rates and salaries of workers and employees in production sectors will be based, for the first time, on an essentially new system: funds earned by the enterprise. This will broaden

the opportunity of developing the competition for increasing production efficiency on the basis of harnessing all reserves and will erect major obstacles to the production of substandard goods and to "working for the warehouse." It will also provide an impetus to increasing the competition among producing enterprises for gaining customers.

We believe that the results of competitiveness will improve sharply if the standards governing the distribution of profits are structured in such a way that enterprises which have reached and surpassed global standards are left a substantially higher share of the profits to dispose as they wish. In this connection, it would be expedient to include in the draft law, at the end of the first paragraph, Point 6, Article 11 (which stipulates that the manufacturing of the most important national economic commodities will be based, as a rule, on competition), after the words "enterprises, associations and organizations which have achieved successes as a result of scientific and technical competition and who have won the competition will be given priority in material and moral incentives and will have their profit (income) increased" to add the following: "To this effect the standards governing the distribution of profits (income) which will be set for them will guarantee them a higher percentage of profit left at the full disposal of the enterprise."

Major opportunities for improving the organization of the competition are tied to the financial-credit mechanism. The problem is to convert prices, finances and credits into powerful means of strengthening cost accounting and offering advantages to the labor collectives which have been most successful in radically upgrading the efficiency of public production. In our view, it would be expedient, as has already been suggested, to allocate to enterprises of funds for the most important areas of reproduction on a competitive basis and to assign priorities in granting credits to efficiently working collectives. This stipulation should have been reflected in Article 18.

The draft law calls for granting extensive rights and responsibilities to labor collectives of enterprises in solving many problems in their activities. In this connection I would like to suggest the following: according to the draft law the general assembly (conference) of the labor collective will make socialist pledges (Article 6) and the ratification of the conditions for the socialist competition will be within the competence of the enterprise's labor collective's council (Article 7). However, this document is as important in promoting the competition as the pledges taken by the labor collective. Furthermore, it is the base for the adoption of substantiated obligations. That is why it would seem expedient for the formulation of conditions for socialist competition to be the prerogative of the general assembly (conference) of the labor collective.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

TO REFLECT PLANNING PRINCIPLES MORE FULLY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 55-56

[Article by V. Kulkov, docent, Moscow State University]

[Text] The draft law is a major step forward in our understanding of the ways and means of implementing the planning principle on the enterprise level. The intensification of the principle of democratic centralism means that planning, as a socialist production relation is increasingly becoming the manifestation of democratic, flexible and malleable economic relations. Its basic difference from the one-dimensional, rigid and bureaucratic centralism, which paralyzed the initiative of producers, is becoming increasingly apparent. The broadening of enterprise independence under contemporary conditions presumes the active functioning of commodity-monetary relations and the fuller use of the economic role of the enterprise as a commodity producer. However, it is of essential importance to emphasize, in this case, that the broadening of enterprise autonomy and the enhancement of commodity-monetary relations should not eliminate the features of the socialist enterprise above all as a subject of national economic management. That is why it would be expedient for the stipulation on the socialist enterprises as basic units of the single national economic complex, as expressed in Point 1 of Article 1, to be supplemented as follows: "Functioning on the basis of the national means of production assigned to them and basing their activities on the state plan for economic and social development, the enterprises are subjects of economic management by the whole people."

In our view, the last paragraph of Point 1, Article 1, which stipulates that "the enterprise....has its own share of the property of the whole people" should be refined. Under the conditions of a planned economy the concept of "separate" can be used only if its limits are stipulated. Therefore, a more accurate formulation would be following: "The enterprise....has a share of the means of production of the whole people assigned to it" or else "the enterprise....owns a relatively separate share of the property of the whole people."

The draft of the following concept in Point 3 of Article 2 should be amended. It reads as follows: "The labor collective, which is the full owner of the enterprise, independently solves all problems." In our view, this formula is excessively categorical: it absolutizes the right and independence of

enterprise labor collectives. Under these circumstances, such rights and independence could be viewed also as unrelated to the nationwide form of ownership and economic management, as being "automatic." A more accurate draft would be as follows: "The labor collective, which uses the nationwide means of production assigned to it as their owner, independently solves all problems of production, economic and social development within its range of competence, guided by the principle of combining the interests of society with those of the collective and the individual worker, with the priority of the former."

Changes in the ways and means of planning are not the same as diminishing the role of the plan. In this connection, the stipulation of the need for strict implementation of plans and obligations by enterprises, contained in the final paragraph of Point 5, Article 10, is of essential importance. Considering the particular significance of this stipulation, in our view, it should become a separate point of Article 10. It should also be supplemented with the statement that "the planning authorities systematically supervise the implementation of enterprise plan assignments and obligations." Ensuring such control is the most important means of implementing national interest and a national form of ownership and economic management.

The main assignment of the socialist enterprise cannot be stipulated without indicating the role of the plan. The objectives of comprehensively meeting social requirements, increasing the enterprise's contribution to acceleration, and so on, cannot be met outside a plan. Point 3 of Article 1, which defines the main task of the enterprise, however, does not mention the plan. Therefore, after the first paragraph of said point (i.e., after the main task of the enterprise has been formulated) the following words should be added: "The implementation of this task is inseparably related to the implementation of the enterprise's plans and obligations."

Under the new circumstances, state orders will be one of the specific means of planning enterprise activities. We must emphasize that the state order is the most important form of centralized management. It would be expedient, therefore, in our view, to have a separate Article 10 or a separate paragraph of Point 3 of said article especially dealing with state orders (describing their nature, priority, nonfulfillment penalties, etc.). It should also be pointed out in this item that "increasing in the plan the share of commodities not included in the state order should be based on the creation of conditions which would guarantee the production of commodities needed by society."

The draft law greatly emphasizes long-term economic standards, which are a useful instrument in planned management. In particular, the law stipulates that "standards governing the distribution of profits...must set identical state requirements concerning the use of enterprise resources" (Point 3, Article 17). This stipulation, however, does not clearly indicate the type of standards to which this applies: joint (uniform) or differentiated (individual). In our view, it should be stipulated (as a reflection of the real level and dialectics of economic relations under which socialist enterprises function) that this refers to the "economic standards which ensure objectively developed differences in production-technical, economic and social conditions prevailing at enterprises." It should also be stipulated that "the

possibility of applying joint (uniform) standards should be gradually broadened."

Unquestionably, improvements in the means and methods of planned management should be based on the requirements of the objective economic law of planned development and the entire system of production relations. Therefore, a general stipulation should be included on the connection between the stipulations of the Law on the State Enterprise and the objective economic laws of socialism. This can be best accomplished in the preamble, which could include the following text: "The Law on the State Enterprise (Association) proceeds from the need to take into consideration the requirements of the objective economic laws of socialism, above all the law of planned development, the basic economic law, the law of distribution according to labor and the law of value."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 56-57

[Text] V. Shper, senior scientific associate, candidate of technical sciences:

The text of Point 2, Article 4 does not make clear the reason for which it is not up to the labor collective to choose the type of work system it should use. The enterprise itself will convert to a two- or three-shift work should it finds this to be economically profitable. I therefore suggest that the following words be added to this point: "with the agreement of the labor collective," and that the last sentence be deleted.

Point 2 of Article 14 does not provide a clear answer on how to set up a work system should differences develop with the soviet of people's deputies. Whose decision should be considered final?

Point 2 of Article 7 does not indicate what to do should differences develop between the council of the labor collective and the trade union committee.

Point 4 of Article 8 should should refine the procedure describing the establishment of certification commissions. I suggest the following text: "Certification commissions consist of representatives of the administration, the public organizations, the labor collective's council and representatives of the labor collective, elected at its annual meeting."

In Point 2 of Article 11 the words "nonrecoverable losses" should be deleted and specific steps should be indicated. For example, an enterprise producing substandard goods should be held accountable as follows:

- a. All of its economic incentive funds would be frozen;
- b. Its personnel would be paid no more than 70 percent of its wages;
- c. The enterprise management and the chairman of the labor collective's council would be held personally materially and disciplinarily responsible (and, if necessary, would also be criminally liable).

In Point 6 of Article 14, I suggest that the following be added after the words "implemented at the enterprises:" "by joint decision of the administration, the labor collective's council and the trade union committee. Differences to be settled at the general meeting of the labor collective."

V. Yudin, engineer:

The enterprise consists of a clearly defined labor collective with its own elected self-governing authorities. What stands behind the association? As long as it is a question of obligations and responsibilities, everything is clear. But what about rights? It is impossible to hold an efficient conference of representatives of labor collectives within an association. It does not have a permanent labor collective council, a single party, Komsomol or any other public organization or a trade union committee. This means that all current decisions will be made by the association's administration which, at best, would coordinate them with the council, trade union committee and party committee of the head enterprise.

In order to intensify the true democratization of production and economic relations in solving social problems justly and ensuring the real self-governing by labor collectives, the law should address itself to the enterprise only. The association of enterprises should be based on the agreement of the labor collectives and ratified by the superior authorities but not dictated by them.

The functions and the extent to which current or long-term planning and management should be entrusted to a general authority should be a matter of agreement between each labor collective and the state as represented by its structural administrative institutions.

E. Burov, chief, PO department, Kishinevskiy Traktorny Zavod:

Some parts of the draft law concerning elected managers are unclear. Obviously, the implementation of this principle should not apply to a number of heads of functional services, some special subdivisions, and so on. It is easy to anticipate specific cases in which electing a manager (a bureau chief) could harm the enterprise and force the director to reorganize the enterprise's structure in order to avoid working with elected but inadequately trained or, in his view, poor managers. I suggest the following addition to Point 2 of Article 6:

The positions covered by the principle of electivity must be approved by joint decision of the labor collective's council and the enterprise's management once in 3-4 years and refined in reorganizing the structure of the enterprise. The labor collective's council will set a procedure for the election of managers (nomination, competition, balloting, etc.).

I submit the following draft for Point 2 of Article 11:

The broad, comprehensive and timely use of the achievements of science and technology and the production of efficient and high-quality goods is the most important way of increasing the income of the enterprise and self-financing

its production and social development. An enterprise which markets goods the parameters of which meet or are superior to high world standards will use lower rates in withholdings from profits for the state budget and the superior organization. Such rates will be increased should the enterprise produce obsolete or substandard goods.

The responsibility of material and technical procurement authorities must be increased in the case of delayed procurements, for today this is one of the main factors for substandard output and a factor which holds back the growth of output. I suggest the following text to be added to Paragraph 1, Point 2 of Article 15:

The territorial material and technical supply authorities bear economic responsibility for supplying the enterprises with raw materials, materials, complementing items and equipment. They must compensate in full the enterprise for any harm caused as a result of incomplete or delayed satisfaction of enterprise orders based on approved standards.

In frequent cases the enterprise finds it profitable to lower its prices, for this could ensure a more efficient utilization of its resources. This could save the national economy unnecessary freight haulage, release production capacities, and so on. Furthermore, price reductions may be more advantageous in cases of self-support. Yet the mechanism for setting new prices remains quite cumbersome, and although a price reduction should be encouraged, this circumstance has not been reflected in the draft law.

I suggest adding a Point 12 to Article 17, to read as follows:

The enterprise has the right independently to solve the question of lowering the price of its commodities should this lead to reduced production costs or increased enterprise profits from greater demand.

Although Article 20 "Utilization and Protection of the Environment" should be such as substantially to improve the state of affairs in that area, nonetheless the second paragraph of Point 3 of this article should be redrafted as follows:

The enterprise will fully compensate for the harm caused as a result of environmental pollution and inefficient use of natural resources, by recomputing the corresponding funds to be paid to the budgets of the local soviets; the respective officials will be held materially and criminally liable for violating environmental protection laws. The local soviets have the right to fine enterprises and officials for substandard hygiene on their territory. Such fines will be paid to the local soviets.

For violating the standards set for the utilization of regional resources, the enterprise will make higher payments to the budgets of the local soviets. The amounts of such payments will be set by the local soviets.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

LENINISM, REVOLUTION, CONTEMPORANEITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 58-68

[Text] The approaching 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution reminds us particularly strongly of the role of Leninism in the struggle for the establishment of a society based on social justice.

The personality of Lenin is related to a particular stage in the development of revolutionary Marxist theory. It is based on the profound analysis of the new historical age, the most outstanding event in which was the victory of the Great October Revolution and the innovative conclusions based on the tremendous and comprehensive experience gained in the struggle for the triumph of the proletarian revolution in Russia, the assertion of the foundations of the socialist system and justice in relations among nations. Leninism is one of the highest spiritual achievements of mankind: In illuminating the path to comprehensive social progress, it provides a firm ideological and theoretical support in the development of all areas of spiritual culture and the further enhancement and strengthening of the role of progressive social awareness.

At the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that the party's constant reference to Lenin's thoughts and ideas is not simply a mark of profound respect or acknowledgment of Lenin's authority. The aspiration to restore as completely as possible the spirit of Leninism under contemporary conditions is dictated by the vital need of social progress.

The restructuring of our entire life, initiated by the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is the direct continuation of the October Revolution. Its objective is to implement the principles and ideals of the socialist revolution, cleansed from any encrustations, to accelerate the progress of the new society, and to reorganize all aspects of its life on a Leninist basis, systematically and creatively developed by the Communist Party. The eventual success of restructuring is unquestionable; it is guaranteed by the efficient support of the popular masses and their confidence in the accuracy of contemporary party strategy, the strategy of their tried political leader. The party found within itself the strength and courage to analyze directly and openly, in a profound and realistic Leninist manner, the encrustations of previous decades, to expose the reasons for errors and omissions and to lead the people into removing from our path anything stagnating and eliminating the exposed "obstruction mechanisms."

In a Leninist self-critical manner the party began the restructuring with itself, with the reinterpretation of the style and methods of work of party organizations and committees in the light of the current tasks, and with the radical renovation of its policy. At the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee meeting and at its 27th Congress, it raised the banner of Leninism high and proudly, firmly rejecting dogmatic efforts to separate theory from practice and to bring revolutionary ideas down to the level of irresponsible propaganda phraseology which concealed and justified laziness, cowardly thinking, political passiveness and practical helplessness, combined with complacency and arrogance. The study of the negative phenomena which had accumulated and the reasons for them, and the efficient and clear formulation of problems which had become crucial and were of vital importance to the country and to the development of socialism, and their pointed description to the people enabled the party to formulate a theory and policy of restructuring, scientifically substantiated and consistent with the interests of social progress and the working people, and clearly confirmed the creative power and truly contemporary nature of Leninism.

Leninism is burdened neither by a time frame nor national exclusivity. It appeared and developed as the philosophy of the new age in the history of mankind thanks to the October Revolution, which was destined to solve problems of universal nature. In Russia "local," national and general historical problems had become closely intertwined. The proletarian revolution--an opening to a new social system--was the only outcome of this web of oppression, difficulties and suffering into which the bourgeois-landowning rulers and "one's own and foreign exploiters and a predatory imperialist war had led the Russian people." The October Revolution not only provided a solution to the national crisis but also indicated the way to solving the imminent contradictions in global development. It proclaimed the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind. "Time," the CPSU Central Committee appeal to the Soviet people on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution notes, "profoundly revealed its permanent significance and illuminated the tremendous opportunities offered by socialist social development." Creative Marxism-Leninism remains the scientific, ideological-theoretical and spiritual-ideological base of a new type of social progress, a method for interpreting and solving the contradictions of the contemporary age.

In the 70 years since the October Revolution, Lenin's scientific prediction proved its accuracy, vitality and practical efficiency. The new social system prevailed and strengthened, passing the test of time and withstanding even the most difficult trials, not only in our country, for many peoples on earth have converted to socialism or are actively struggling or leaning toward socialism. The successful radical changes which have taken place in some 15 countries and the comprehensive experience acquired in revolutionary struggle by almost 100 communist and worker parties throughout the world clearly prove the inexhaustible possibilities of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism as applicable to the specific sociohistorical conditions of different countries and in solving new, previously unknown problems of social progress which are formulated by our age. Leninism is the theory and method for solving even the most difficult contradictions. It is the ideological and theoretical foundation of the active revolutionary transforming activities of the people's

masses. It is the ideology of cohesion among all revolutionary, progressive and democratic forces of mankind, the ideology of the triumph of the supreme ideals of humanism.

The theoretical depth and vitality of creative Marxism-Leninism were manifested with particular clarity in the development of the new political style of thinking, which takes into consideration the realities of our age and gives priority to human values and to safeguarding civilization and life itself on earth. The idea of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems is the deeply dialectical nucleus of the new style of political thinking. It is a fruitful foundation for the proper interpretation of the present and the future of our conflicting yet interdependent and largely integral world.

The new historical conditions formulate strict requirements concerning the awareness of the Soviet people and their ability to act in a concerted and energetic manner, proceeding from their responsibility for the future of the country and socialism. Currently the competition between the two global systems has reached a stage at which, as the CPSU Central Committee appeal notes, "Our economy is being tested for its efficiency, its receptiveness to progressive technologies and its ability to provide first-rate goods and withstand any competition on the world markets. Our morality and our entire way of life are being tested for their ability steadily to develop and enrich the values of socialist democracy, social justice and humanism. Our foreign policy is being tested for its firmness and consistency in the defense of peace and flexibility and restraint under the conditions of the feverish arms race promoted by imperialism and its exacerbation of international tensions." The cohesion of the working people rallied around the ideas of Leninism in the struggle for the implementation of the strategy of acceleration, formulated at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the 27th Party Congress, and of the specific program of action, earmarked at the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum, has become a vital necessity today.

A great deal remains to be done. However, for the time being the planned acceleration of socioeconomic development is by no means being achieved everywhere. As was noted at the January Central Committee Plenum, "Changes for the better are taking place slowly and restructuring has proved to be more difficult and the reasons for the problems which had accumulated in society deeper than we had imagined. The deeper we go into restructuring the clearer its scale and significance become and ever new unsolved problems remaining from the past come to light." The profoundly realistic and sharply critical analysis of such unsolved problems and their origins and reflection in social thought, made at the January Plenum, set a model approach to the urgent practical problems of our building based on creative Leninism. We must constantly apply this approach which helps us to achieve more substantiated, better weighed and more efficient practical solutions and actions.

The mastery of the ideas and methods of Leninism is a universal requirement which does not pertain to managers and organizers or workers on the ideological front alone. It affects everyone. Restructuring, the CPSU Central Committee appeal points out, must become "a nationwide creative laboratory. We shall attentively and critically interpret the practice of

renovation, value each bit of progressive experience, and use and develop it. Live and unfettered thinking is a mandatory prerequisite for acceleration." In order to achieve such joint intellectual work and a universal creative quest, we must properly master the contemporary conclusions drawn by the party, which formulated the theory and policy of restructuring and laid the ideological and theoretical foundations for all CPSU activities: Leninism, the creative Marxism of the 20th century.

The progress made by the first socialist country substantially molded the steadfastness, endurance and firm character of the Soviet person, hardened by trials. However, the heroic qualities of our people did not drop down from the sky. They have nothing mystical. They have entirely natural historical roots and grounds and were hammered out by the Leninist party. The struggle and efforts of millions of people become the more successful the clearer the great ideas became and the more the confidence of the masses grew that the party, guided by Leninism, is leading the people on the right and victorious way. Historical practice and personal example convincingly prove that the more systematically the ideas of Leninism are embodied in life and the richer this life becomes, the faster it changes for the better. Conversely, any deviation from Lenin's behests and the principles and standards of governmental, party and social life he drafted become inadmissible. This was the cause of errors in politics, stagnation in activities and blunders in the education of the people and in molding the public consciousness and spiritual culture. Historical experience teaches that the firmness, activeness, energy and will of the toiling masses grow to the extent to which Leninism is persistently, consistently and creatively applied in the daily practices of economic, state and sociocultural building.

These conclusions are even more pertinent today, during the initiated period of revolutionary restructuring. The problems which became imminent a long time ago and are now clearly formulated in CPSU resolutions are so complex, broad and important that their solution requires the harnessing of all creative forces and the entire energy of the party and the people. Restructuring is not a sum of cosmetic operations carried out without any particular efforts. It means a great deal of work and a lengthy and sometimes sharp struggle. It requires courage, persistence and dedication. "The country," the CPSU Central Committee appeal states, "is going through a demanding and interesting period, when every one of its citizens must make a moral choice. We cannot complete the work we have initiated with indifferent hands or a cold heart. The very essence of this work rejects the philistine morality of time-servers, marginal observers and uninspired consumers. Restructuring needs people who care for it, who are demanding and intolerant of irresponsibility and red tape. It needs political fighters boundlessly loyal to the communist ideals, people who know how to defend and increase our great social, moral and cultural values."

Equally valid today is V.I. Lenin's stipulation that "As always, developing the awareness of the masses is the basis and the main content of our entire work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 13, p 376). It is impossible to raise socialism to a qualitatively new standard and to achieve and consolidate the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development without restructuring, the beginning and the motive force of which is a

restructuring of the mentality, of the awareness of the toiling masses, of the entire people. At all cost we must reach a new standard in the ideological-political and sociomoral quality of the Soviet people and achieve their even closer unity around the party and the objectives of restructuring. A leap forward is necessary in literally all areas and trends of ideological education: updating its ties with life and laying specific organizational foundations as a base of each specific educational task (without which education would remain purely verbal), and radical improvements in the coordinated efforts of all organizations and establishments involved in this project. The political and economic training system assumes great responsibility. The CPSU Central Committee draft which outlines the basic trends of restructuring notes that "It must equip the party members and working people with the ability to think and act with a sense of political maturity, to awaken a lively interest in theoretical knowledge, to learn how to apply it in practice and to contribute to the dissemination and assertion of socialist ideals, a socialist way of life and progressive forms of organization of labor and production." Profound and truly revolutionary changes in social life have been initiated but must be developed to an even greater extent. Their success will be ensured, among others, by the accurate understanding of their meaning by the masses and the readiness of the greatest possible number of people to participate in them actively and independently. In that case the valuable "building material" of restructuring--the innovative social experience of the working people--will be richer, more varied and stronger and the results of restructuring, more fruitful.

One of the most powerful instruments in explaining the party's ideas and their link with the daily practical activities of the masses and the gathering, interpreting and disseminating progressive social experience is our press, which was started with the first issues of Lenin's ISKRA and the bolshevik PRAVDA.

The first issue of PRAVDA came out 75 years ago, on 5 May 1912. It proclaimed most emphatically the credo of this worker newspaper: "Learn the lessons of life and act together!" The party press, which plunged into the contradictions of social development, enhanced the awareness of the proletarian masses and all working people and expressed their expectations and views, widely opening its pages to them, leading the people in the struggle for a better future and for the victory of the socialist revolution. In the 70 years since the October Revolution, has been PRAVDA the true "history of our time." Lenin called upon the party journalists to make and describe this history. PRAVDA's Leninist traditions describe the instructive and creative beginning of press activities, which concentrate the innovative thinking of the working people, for which reason it can act successfully as the collective propagandist, agitator and organizer of living and working in a new style.

Today profound and truly radical changes are taking place in the society, demanding energy, initiative and creative approach and a persistent struggle against inertia and sluggishness. Using their possibilities and applying new and progressive features, and armed with powerful tools such as criticism, openness and dissemination of best experience, the press and all mass information media can and must accomplish a great deal.

An important means of the further growth of the awareness and civic activeness of the Soviet people, their revolutionary spirit and readiness for bold change is their understanding of the organic link and profound continuity between the ideas formulated by V.I. Lenin and the present party line. Inherent in Lenin's ideas is their most crucial and topical aspect: They are the focal point of social life and struggle and demand immediate and persistent practical efforts for their implementation.

One of the most vital and urgent tasks in the progress of the socialist economy is reaching the highest world standards of labor productivity. "Labor productivity," V.I. Lenin wrote in his work 'The Great Initiative,' "is, in the final account, the most important, the main feature in the victory of the new social system" (op. cit., vol 39, p 21). Today this is not a "spare" objective of the distant future but a specific result which the working people must plan and achieve as soon as possible, for it is vitally necessary. Labor productivity must be increased by a factor of 2.3-2.5 by the year 2000. That is why the development of production based on progressive science and technology and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress are a matter of tremendous political importance, which requires the active and interested participation of the toiling masses. V.I. Lenin formulated the question of achieving the highest possible labor productivity on an even broader level, as a matter of ensuring the actual superiority of the new system and of new-type production relations, expressed through a comparison of technical and economic results: "Communism has a higher labor productivity, compared with capitalism, achieved by conscientious and united workers, on a voluntary basis, using progressive equipment" (ibid., p 22). To this effect, V.I. Lenin wrote, a better organization for labor productivity is necessary (see op. cit., vol 36, p 187). As we can see, V.I. Lenin considered as "the most important, the main thing in the victory of the new social system" achieving high labor productivity not by any available means or at all cost but only with the application of a specifically socialist method.

In connection with the adoption of economic production management methods and the serious restructuring of the economic mechanism on all levels, Lenin's concepts on the organization of socialist economic building have become particularly relevant. Economists, journalists and economic managers recall particularly frequently V.I. Lenin's statements during the NEP; in the press we frequently come across direct comparisons between the NEP and the growing independence of enterprises or, let us say, the development of cooperative forms of work and the creation of favorable conditions for individual labor. In this connection, some Western commentators have formulated wild assumptions about a "possible" restoration of capitalism in our country. However, whereas the NEP led to a certain revival of capitalism, the new forms of economic activity at the present stage are developing within the framework of the victorious and fully dominant socialist economy, and the legal and financial control by the socialist state, on the basis of the principles of socialism. The difference between the two is striking and cannot be ignored.

Naturally, however, there also is a direct continuity and profound similarity between the steps which were taken during the NEP and those of today: Their common and profound political-economic content is found in the manifestation, the enhancement and maximal utilization of material and economic interests and

the greatest possible coordination of their activities in the same area. In both cases it is a question of meeting the need for revival, intensifying the efficiency of production relations. However, in 65 years their nature and content have changed radically: At that time the Soviet system was interested in enhancing the interests of the private commodity owner and producer; today its efforts are concentrated mainly and essentially on strengthening the interests of labor collectives and their individual members in the maximally efficient utilization of socialist property put at their disposal, for the sake of the better satisfaction of national interests, achieved through the application of full cost accounting, self-support and self-financing.

The increased economic autonomy of enterprises (associations) and the enhancement of the economic activeness of their collectives are similar to the NEP of the 1920s only to a certain extent, for the NEP applied not only to the socialist system which was weak and the share of which in the economy was small. The strengthening of individual material interest (in state enterprises and elsewhere—in cooperatives and in forms of individual labor) could be considered "bourgeoisification" (an assumption which may be found in KOMMUNIST's editorial mail) only if we totally forget the main principle of socialism: "From each according to his capabilities and to each according to his work," and, furthermore, if we were to identify socialism with general poverty and petit-bourgeois equalization.

The theory of scientific socialism stipulates that the purpose of socialist production is the gradual and full satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the working people based on their labor contribution. The mention of individual material incentive as a lever in building socialism and as an inseparable feature of new production relations is found repeatedly in Lenin's works: The victory of the October Revolution had to be consolidated economically. The energetic and strong social policy formulated at the 27th CPSU Central Congress is one of the proofs that the party is steadily guided by creative Leninism. By comprehensively developing moral incentives and enhancing the prestige of honest, conscientious and dedicated work and the dignity of the working person, this stipulation greatly strengthens the efforts to improve the well-being of the people. That is why concern and fear of any possible harm to the socialist principles should come not from material incentive to work with total dedication and according to capability but the aspiration of economic and ideological officials who give socialism a bureaucratic interpretation, thus frustrating the potential provided by the material incentive of the working people in accelerating the country's socioeconomic progress. "We cannot advance successfully," the party's Central Committee emphasized in its appeal, "without rejecting bureaucratic administration and orders, unnecessary regulations and prohibitions, and without bringing down the wall of official mistrust in the reason and experience of the people and their thrifty and statesmanlike approach to the work."

Nor should we forget the fact that socialist competition is a competition among collectives and individual workers not only for the sake of achieving high work results but also for the right to greater social recognition and a greater share of the social product. Shock work, V.I. Lenin said, means being given preference in consumption.

The main idea of restructuring, which has been initiated in the country--the democratization of all areas of social life--is related to the strengthening of personal and collective material and moral interest in end labor results, steadily improving the entire socialist economic system and the enhancement of independence (and, naturally, responsibility) of collectives and individual workers. This is not a temporary campaign but a general trend of tremendous and systematic work, in the course of which socialist society will strive to reach a new qualitative status. This would be unattainable without eliminating the "obstructing factors" which were critically analyzed at the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This status will be definitely achieved when in the course of restructuring, with the development and intensification of socialist democracy, ever new live forces concealed within the working class and all Soviet popular strata, become involved.

Democratization, as the January Central Committee Plenum emphasized, is the only true way leading to the enhancement of the human factor and a means of its development which is organically inherent in the socialist system. V.I. Lenin had no two opinions on this matter. On different occasions and in different times he persistently repeated that "... The ordinary bourgeois concept that socialism is something dead, frozen, established once and for all, is infinitely false; in fact, the fast, real and true mass progress in all areas of social and private life will begin only with socialism, with the participation of the majority of the population and, subsequently, the entire population" (op. cit., vol 33, pp 99-100); "The live creativity of the masses is the basic factor of the new society" (op. cit., vol 35, p 57); "... It is important to us to involve in the administration of the state literally all working people. This is a tremendously difficult task. However, socialism cannot be introduced by a minority, by the party. It can be introduced by tens of millions of people, once they have learned to do this themselves" (op. cit., vol 36, p 53). Leninism is imbued throughout with faith in the creative forces of the toiling people, and today's party line expresses this Leninist tradition to its fullest extent. It is the duty of each party organization and every party member to implement this party stipulation tirelessly, consistently and comprehensively, not allowing anyone to hinder the processes of democratization or reduce it and, with it, the concept of restructuring, to the level of a beautiful but inefficient propaganda slogan.

There is such a danger. By no means has the gap between words and actions, typical of the recent past, been surmounted everywhere. The press reports cases in which personnel on different levels, while accepting democratization and, as a whole, restructuring in words, hinder them in fact. There also are those who, allegedly having joined restructuring, try to create the appearance of renovation. For example, they allow elections of some officials but merely as a procedure which conceals the old practice of appointments "from above." Hindering the processes of democratization and distorting the meaning of restructuring are phenomena against which we must fight decisively and firmly, aware of their political harm. They compromise the party line, create doubts on the part of some people of the reality of restructuring and, consequently, fetter initiative and promote a passive attitude. Let us recall the words in the CPSU Central Committee appeal: "One must struggle for restructuring, and restructuring must be defended!"

The gap between words and actions, which existed for many years on various levels of social life, was the reason for the blossoming of an excessive multiplication of the tribe of gossipers, time-servers and demagogues who could take up any new slogan but were unwilling to overburden themselves with work. Such chatterers are not only unnecessary but even dangerous to restructuring, for nothing disgusts the working people more than blabbering alienated from life and practical tasks. Let us recall the way in which V.I. Lenin scourged blabberers-conciliationists in 1917: "The word 'revolutionary democracy'," he wrote, "has become in our country (particularly among the S.R. and the mensheviks) almost a cliché, like the expression 'thank God,' which is also used by people who are not all that ignorant as to believe in God...." (op. cit., vol 34, p 165). Mensheviks and S.R. vanished long ago. They are now forgotten. Meanwhile, phrase-mongers, who do nothing to promote restructuring in reality or even who hinder it, abuse the word "restructuring" and use it as an ordinary interjection, grow and multiply. Broad democracy, control by the masses and collectives over the activities and efficiency of the work of officials and investigating the consistency between words and actions and criticism of even the slightest gap between them are among the reliable guarantees that what has been planned and resolved will be in fact implemented.

Naturally, the process of democratization does not consist merely of the observance of democratic procedures. They are only a necessary form which must become a ubiquitous habit. Socialist democracy needs like the air we breathe efficiency and participation in formulating, adopting and implementing decisions--economic, governmental-administrative and others--by the largest possible number of people. Unquestionably, among the many valuable instructions left by V.I. Lenin on this range of problems, which are now particularly relevant, the great Leninist idea of organizing universal accountability and control deserves special attention and a contemporary interpretation and practical application. The great importance which V.I. Lenin himself ascribed to this task is seen also by the fact that he returned to it repeatedly and the way he formulated it (for example, he considered the creation of a system of nationwide accountability and control a mandatory prerequisite for the normal functioning of the first phase of the communist system (see op. cit., vol 33, p 101). This is one of the main ways of enhancing the revolutionary creativity of the masses.

The organization of universal and mass accountability and control is important above all from the economic viewpoint, for under the conditions of the conversion of enterprises to self-financing and cost accounting, when the need for the conservation and maximally efficient utilization of all resources becomes more crucial, it is only the creation of such a comprehensive system that guarantees success. Increased production efficiency is directly related to involving the majority or, even better, all working people in economic searching. Communism, V.I. Lenin wrote, begins with the concern shown by the working people for the conservation and multiplication of the common, the people's property. Universal accountability and control are the most accurate way of implementing the principles of social justice, for the proper and reliable control over the measure of labor and consumption can be ensured not only through state measures but also mandatorily as a result of well organized efforts by the public. The organization of a system of nationwide

accountability and control is of tremendous political importance, for no increase in elective positions can provide such scope for involving in the administration of production, governmental and social affairs (including those beyond public production and applicable to all social groups) the majority of the working people and subsequently, as V.I. Lenin dreamed, literally the entire population. The system of mass accountability and control provides additional opportunities for the democratization of life in socialist society. It is a reliable tool in the struggle against bureaucratism and formalism; the creation and strengthening of such a system will enable us significantly to reduce the administrative apparatus which is today obviously inflated. Unfortunately, this basic Leninist idea is also one of the least developed in Soviet social science, although life has confirmed its increased practical relevance and the tremendous role it plays in creating contemporary forms of social organization inherent in socialism and in developing the socialist self-government by the people.

The process of democratization must go upward. This means not only a more active solution of all of its problems, such as increasing openness, developing and enhancing the constructive and efficient nature of criticism and self-criticism, and so on. It also means reliable and independent experience, based on practice, in training the growing generations in socialist democracy. To this day, however, children's and youth organizations suffer from formalism and excessive organization and most frequently self-government in schools—from secondary to VUZ—exists on paper only. V.I. Lenin repeatedly spoke for a reason of the autonomy of the youth movement: Independence and responsibility are qualities which cannot be developed by methods other than practical experience.

Democracy, socialist self-government and independent activities and personal responsibility for its results are the best educators. As long as they are unavailable, complaints about shortcomings in youth education will be customary. When independence and self-organization by young people, not only at work but also in politics and social life become a standard of life and a daily rule, the collective self-upbringing of the growing generation will become the most powerful ally of educators and mentors. At that point we shall realize how right V.I. Lenin was: "We are struggling better than did our fathers. Our children will struggle even better and they will win!" (op. cit., vol 23, p 256). Naturally, this applies not simply to independence of discussion and action by itself but the type of independence which is based on the implementation of Lenin's behests by the young: to learn communism, creatively combining knowledge with practical experience; to develop a clear class-political viewpoint and, together with workers and peasants, to participate in labor and struggle; to check its actions against the demands of communist morality. "Today the social significance of having daring and courageous people, ready to fight for the implementation of decisions, intelligent and conscientious workers and promoters of socialism, is higher than ever," M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his speech at the 20th Komsomol Congress, in appealing to the Komsomol to be the young guard of restructuring. "Restructuring needs independent people who do not wait for instructions for each petty matter but assume responsibility, and who finish what they start in major and minor matters."

The scale and complexity of the initiated revolutionary changes require a significant upsurge in the level of spiritual culture of the Soviet people. The participants in restructuring need contemporary and firmly mastered professional and sociolegal knowledge, a broad outlook and a clear political stance. All in all, these tasks are known and are being implemented within the educational system and in other forms of cultural and ideological work.

Nonetheless, upbringing and the practical application of the class-political approach deserve a separate discussion. Its contemporary forms have been obviously insufficiently studied by social scientists and in social consciousness and in daily practical work class-political assessment is used timidly, in generalities and, sometimes, conversely, sharply and not directed at specific individuals, as vulgar sociology sadly reminds us. Both extremes are bad. The second, however, was condemned and criticized and, being clearer, is easier to identify and render harmless. The former--lack of liking for a class-political approach when the latter is suitable and even necessary--is manifested frequently. However, by no means is it always critically assessed. This becomes particularly striking in connection with an interest in history, which has increased today, and which is also becoming more democratic: it is becoming more popular; topics or individuals which were either forgotten or ignored are being discussed, which is consistent with the need for truth and for a comprehensive interpretation of the past. However, some excesses in this process may be noted: Occasionally not only journalists but also specialists display an amateurish approach in their effort to become the focal point of social attention, for which purpose they create false sensations, ignore the requirements of scientific objectivity and accuracy, allow subjectivism and prejudice in assessing and reassessing not only individual historical events and personalities but entire historical periods and profound social processes. Occasionally a broad view on history is confused with lack of discrimination and the accuracy of conceptual evaluations is lost. In itself, the existence of different opinions is not bad. What is bad is when the results of immature thinking are hastily and persistently fed to the public, and when a distorted perception of history becomes more or less widespread. An accurate, truthful and respectful attitude and comprehensive study, without "blank spots" and "suppression of personalities," is demanded by our entire history, prerevolutionary, post-October, and Soviet.

It is only by combining the objective study of facts and intellectual scope with an accurate class-political evaluation that we can correctly understand the complexity and contradictions as the past, including the history of our country, which gave birth to the present society and which will lead us into the future. Socialism is the result of universal history. It is the legitimate heir of anything that is valuable and progressive and that was created by world culture; it is a worthy representative and defender of the highest human values.

Our society, which has encompassed the wealth of the historical past, is the offspring of the October Revolution. Today's accomplishments, tasks and plans of the Communist Party and the Soviet people are the direct continuation of the Great October Revolution. Soviet patriotism is a patriotism of a new type, for it is inseparable from proletarian and socialist internationalism.

Soviet patriotism combines the power of feelings and warm love for the homeland, for all fraternal peoples in the USSR and for its history with the highest intellectual and spiritual values of our time and with a scientific understanding of the future of socialist progress. Soviet patriotism is a patriotism of action, for it is imbued with the motivation of actively participating in the profound and daring changes which must be carried out and with the revolutionary spirit of Leninism.

Leninism is the concentrated manifestation of the most advanced social philosophy of our time. It is alien to any kind of one-sidedness or caste or national exclusivity. It is no accident that V.I. Lenin considered the interest of social progress to be the highest interest of the working class; it was precisely V.I. Lenin who proclaimed a fight to the death against nationalism and chauvinism. In Leninism internationalism acquired a conceptual meaning and significance. That is why Leninism opposes anything which divides, which splits the ranks of fighters for daring revolutionary change and for social and national liberation of all peoples on earth, and for lasting peace, security and democratic cooperation among countries and nations. The ideas of Leninism are the banner rallying all progressive mankind.

To restore the spirit of Leninism as completely as possible under contemporary conditions means to ensure its creative application in the theory and policy of restructuring, which is taking place in our country; it means to observe the behests of the Great Revolution which is creating something new on a historical scale; it means to assert the ideas of peace and humaneness for all mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

LENIN. ESSAY ON THE INTERDEPENDENCE OF HIS IDEAS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 69-80

[Article by Gyorgy Lukacs. Continued from KOMMUNIST No 6 for 1987]

[Text] IV. Imperialism: World War and Civil War

But have we entered the period of decisive revolutionary battles? Has the time come when the proletariat, at the risk of its disappearance as a class, must carry out its mission of transforming the world? For unquestionably no kind of ideological or organizational maturity of the proletariat could guarantee the solution of this problem unless such a maturity and resolve to engage in the struggle are not the consequence of an objective socioeconomic situation in the world which urgently requires the making of this decision.

In Russia and beyond it the division between the right and left wings within the labor movement increasingly developed as a debate on the general nature of the age, on whether the familiar and increasingly frequent economic phenomena (capital concentration, increased importance of big banks, colonialism, etc.) were merely a manifestation of the quantitative growth of indicators of "normal" capitalist development or a confirmation of the approaching new age of capitalism—imperialism. Should we consider the increased frequency of wars after a relative period of peace (the Boer War, the Spanish-American War, the Russo-Japanese War, and so on) "accidental" or "isolated" or should we see in them the initial features of a period of increasingly fierce wars? Finally, if the development of capitalism had thus entered a new stage, were the old methods of struggle waged by the proletariat sufficient for it to implement its class interest under such changed circumstances? Correspondingly, were the new forms of class struggle waged by the proletariat, which developed before the Russian revolution and during it (mass strikes, armed uprising), events of purely local and specific significance, or perhaps even "errors" and "blunders," or should they be considered as the first spontaneous efforts, launched in accordance with a true class instinct displayed by the masses in an effort to coordinate their actions with the situation which had developed in the world?

Lenin's practical answer to the interrelated set of such questions is known. It was expressed most clearly in the fact that, almost immediately after the defeat of the Russian revolution and long before the complaints of the mensheviks and it was wrong "to go too far" had quieted down, at the Stuttgart

Congress of the Second International, Lenin fought for the International to assume a clear stance concerning the direct threat presented by a world imperialist war and tried to influence this stance in terms of what had to be done to prevent such a war. Nonetheless, when in August 1914--and for a long period of time after that--Lenin was the only one to defend this point of view on the World War. This was hardly accidental, and could be explained even less by citing psychological or moral considerations, such as the fact that many people who, in the past, had equally "accurately" condemned imperialism, had now begun to hesitate because of their "cowardice," and so on. No. The views held by the various socialist trends in August 1914 were the direct actual consequence of their older theoretical, tactical, etc., behavior.

Lenin's concept of imperialism is an outstanding theoretical accomplishment. His superiority and unparalleled theoretical exploit was his ability specifically to link the economic theory of imperialism to all political problems of his time without exception, and to consider the economy of the new phase of capitalism the guideline for all specific activities undertaken during such critically important circumstances.

Lenin's theory of imperialism is not only a theory of its economically legitimate appearance and of its economic framework, as was believed by Rosa Luxemburg, but a theory of specific class forces unleashed by imperialism; it is a theory of a specific situation in the world, created by imperialism. When Lenin studies the nature of monopoly capitalism, he is interested above all in a specific global situation and class stratification created by imperialism; he is interested in the way the class structure of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat changes as a result of capital concentration. Monopoly capitalism creates a world economy in the strict meaning of this term. This means, above all, that, for the first time in history, nations oppressed and exploited by capitalism engage no longer in an isolated struggle against their oppressors but find themselves totally involved in the whirlpool of a world war. The developed colonial policy of capitalism means the exploitation of colonial peoples not only through primitive plunder, as was the case at the start of the development of capitalism, but also the reorganization of their social structure, making it capitalist. The inevitable ideological consequence of this is the development of the struggle for national independence. The aggressive capitalist development triggered national movements in all peoples of Europe, who previously "had no history." At that point, however, their national liberation struggle developed no longer as a struggle against domestic feudalism or feudal absolutism, i.e., as an unquestionably progressive struggle, but inevitably became part of the imperialist rivalry among world powers. Its historical significance and assessment, therefore, depend on the specific function it assumed in this specific combination of events.

The importance of this question was fully realized by Marx himself. Naturally, in his time this was essentially an English problem--the problem of England's relations with Ireland. Marx realized that it was only the struggle for national liberation of Ireland that could create a truly efficient front in the struggle waged by the English proletariat against the English bourgeoisie.

Marx's concept was not only rejected by the English labor movement in his time but also from the theory and practices of the Second International. Here as well it was Lenin's fate to revive this theory but only in a more lively, more specific manner than Marx had done. For from a general universal historical problem it became a current matter, for which reason it was treated by Lenin not as theory but in entirely practical terms. This too was Lenin's fate: to take a decisive step from theory to practice. However, it was precisely this step, something which must never be forgotten, that also meant theoretical progress. This was a step from the abstract to the concrete.

The transition from the abstract to the concrete in the accurate assessment of current historical reality and from a general stipulation of the revolutionary nature of the entire age of imperialism to a specific situation aggravates the question of the special nature of the revolution. One of Marx's greatest theoretical accomplishments was that he distinguished between a bourgeois and a proletarian revolution. However, in vulgar Marxism such a division degenerated into an automatic rigid separation. Among the opportunists, the practical consequence of this division is a schematic summation of an empirically accurate observation: since each revolution in modern times begins as a bourgeois revolution, it could be supported through proletarian actions, demands, and so on. According to the opportunists, the revolution in such cases is only a bourgeois revolution and the task of the proletariat is to support such a revolution.

What follows from such a distinction between a bourgeois and proletarian revolution is that the proletariat should abandon its own revolutionary objectives.

However, the left-radical concept, which acknowledges the proletarian-revolutionary nature of our age, falls into the opposite yet equally dangerous mechanistic situation. Proceeding from the fact that on a universal historical scale in the age of imperialism the bourgeoisie no longer plays a revolutionary role, but nonetheless proceeding with an equally mechanistic separation between a bourgeois and proletarian revolution, it means that henceforth we have entered a period of purely proletarian revolution. This concept leads to the dangerous practical consequence that all movements of breakdown and ferment which appear in the imperialist age (agrarian, colonial and national problems) are, in the context of a proletarian revolution as well, objectively revolutionary, are left unattended or, even worse, even rejected. The theoreticians of such a "pure" proletarian revolution voluntarily abandon the real and the most important allies of the proletariat, ignoring the revolutionary environment which creates specific opportunities for a proletarian revolution and expecting in such an airless space preparations for "pure" proletarian revolution. "Anyone who waits for 'pure' social revolution," Lenin writes, "will never live to see it. Such a person is a revolutionary in words only, with no understanding of what true revolution is" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, p 54).

For real revolution means the dialectical growth of a bourgeois into a proletarian revolution. An accurate understanding of this state of affairs offers unparalleled opportunities for increasing the possibilities and opportunities for a proletarian revolution. At the same time, however, it

also raises unique requirements concerning the revolutionary proletariat and its leading party. The proletariat is faced with the need of rising to the status of leader of all the oppressed, rising above itself.

Therefore, an imperialist war comprehensively creates allies of the proletariat, if the proletariat wages a revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. However, should the proletariat fail to realize its status and tasks, it is forced to follow in the tail end of the bourgeoisie, on the path of horrifying self-decay. In this case it is a question not of a choice of whether or not the proletariat wishes to fight; the only possible choice is the interests for which it would be fighting--its own or those of the bourgeoisie. The question which history sets to the proletariat is not that of a choice between war and peace but between imperialist war and a war against that war--a civil war.

The need for the proletariat to wage a civil war in opposition to an imperialist war is determined, as all of its methods of struggle, by the conditions which the development of capitalist production, the development of bourgeois society, impose on the proletariat. The imperialist phase of capitalism proves that capitalism has reached a state at which the question of its life or death must be settled. Guided by the true instinct of a class accustomed to rule and realizing that as its realm of domination broadens and its apparatus expands, the actual political base of its domination is narrowed, the bourgeoisie makes most energetic efforts to broaden this base (by leading the middle-classes, corrupting the labor aristocracy, etc.), as well as in order to deal decisive blows at its main enemies, before they have become strong enough to oppose it efficiently. It is able to control the state apparatus and closely to identify itself with it to such an extent that even seemingly purely economic demands formulated by the working class crash even more strongly against the wall the bourgeoisie has erected and, in an effort to prevent the worsening of their economic situation or the loss of already gained positions, the workers are forced to fight the power of the state (and therefore, although subconsciously, to engage in a struggle for governmental power).

As far as the imperialist war is concerned, it is a manifestation of the extreme aggravation of this situation. The bourgeoisie gives the proletariat a choice: to kill its own fellow-class workers from other countries for the sake of the interests of the monopolies and to die for such interests or else to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie by the force of arms.

The importance of Lenin's theory of imperialism is that Lenin accomplished something no one else could: with strict theoretical consistency he determined this interconnection between world war and social development as a whole and most clearly proved it with the specific example of war. However, since historical materialism is the theory of the class struggle of the proletariat, the formulation of this interconnection would be incomplete unless the theory of imperialism is not also a theory of different trends within the labor movement in the age of imperialism. It is a question, consequently, not only of clearly realizing the way the proletariat must act in accordance with its class interests under the new global circumstances which develop as a result of a war, but also to indicate the theoretical

grounds of other views, labeling themselves "proletarian" in terms of imperialism and an imperialist war, and the type of redeployment of forces within proletarian ranks that would be consistent with such theories, thus turning them into specific political trends.

Lenin, and once again Lenin alone, realized clearly, from the very beginning of the World War, that the attitude of Scheidemann, Plekhanov, Vandervelde and others toward the World War was nothing but the logical application of the principles of revisionism to the existing circumstances.

In short, what is the nature of revisionism? First, the fact that it tries to surmount the so-called "one-sidedness" of historical materialism, which considers in their totality the phenomena which take place in social history exclusively from the proletarian class viewpoint. Revisionism adopts as its starting point the interests of "society as a whole." However, since such overall interests--unless considered in their specific terms--simply do not exist; and since that which could be considered as overall interests is nothing but the struggle among different class forces at any given moment, the revisionist considers the constantly changing result of the historical process as a fixed methodological starting point. Therefore, theoretically as well, it turns things upside-down. Compromise is always and inevitably the result of the practical consequence of such an initial theoretical postulate. Revisionism is always eclectic. This means that it tries, theoretically, to dull class contradictions, to smoothen them and to consider such contradictions, which have been turned upside-down and which exist in its imagination only, as a criterion in the assessment of any event.

Second, it is on such grounds that revisionism rejects dialectics, for dialectics is the conceptual manifestation of the fact that in reality the development of society takes place in the course of the dynamics of opposites, and that such opposites (opposite classes, the antagonistic nature of their economic life, and so on) are the foundation and the mirror of anything which may be taking place, and that the "unity" of society, as long as it is based on class stratification, could exist only as an abstract concept and a constantly changing result of the interaction between such opposites. Since as a method dialectics is only the theoretical aspect of the real condition of society, in the course of which its advance takes place in the course of the dynamics of contradictions and the transition of one opposite to another, i.e., in a revolutionary manner, inevitably the theoretical rejection of dialectics means an essential break with any kind of revolutionary action.

Third, since the revisionists thus refuse to acknowledge the fact that dialectics with the dynamics of its contradictions which, precisely, is what creates constantly something new, exists in reality, the historical, specific, new features disappear from their way of thinking. The revisionist considers obviously unscientific even the idea that a new situation which does not fit the "eternal and inviolable laws" may develop, or else a situation the outcome of which depends on the decisions made by the proletariat.

Fourth, to the revisionists capitalist society is a reality which is as unconfirmed by essential changes as it is to the bourgeoisie. The revisionists no longer consider bourgeois society as something which appeared

historically, for which reason it is historically doomed to disappear, in precisely in the same manner that they do not consider science a means of studying the age of this disappearance and the actual means of acceleration, considering it at best a means of improving the situation of the proletariat within bourgeois society. Any thinking which goes beyond the framework of bourgeois society is, to the revisionist, illusion and utopia.

Fifth, for this reason revisionism is imbued with the so-called "realpolitik" approach. It constantly sacrifices the true interests of the class as a whole (the systematic defense of which he considers utopianism) for the sake of protecting the current interests of its individual groups. Even if we were to stop with these brief remarks, it would be obvious that revisionism was able to become a real trend in the labor movement only because the new processes in the development of capitalism allowed some worker strata to gain temporary economic benefits from this situation and because the organizational form of worker parties ensure such strata and their intellectual representatives greater influence than even the inconsistent and only instinctive revolutionism of the broad proletarian masses. The common feature of all opportunistic trends is that they never consider current events from the class viewpoint of the proletariat, for which reason they pursue a nonhistorical and nondialectic, an eclectic "realpolitik."

The view of opportunism as a specific trend in the labor movement means that opportunism is the class enemy of the proletariat within its own camp. In order to prepare for a proletarian revolution, therefore, it is absolutely necessary for the workers to free themselves, spiritually and organizationally, from such a corrupting influence. Understanding the nature of the age must be the starting point for such training. The proletariat must, above all, develop its own accurate class awareness, so that with its help it can become the leader in the real liberation struggle and the true world revolution.

V. The State as Weapon

The revolutionary nature of the age is manifested most clearly in the fact that the struggle among classes and parties is no longer a confrontation within a specific state system but blasts its boundaries wide open and crosses them. On the one hand it is a struggle for state power; on the other, and at the same time, the state itself becomes an open participant in the struggle, revealing its nature as a weapon in the class struggle, as one of the most important tools in preserving class rule.

Marx and Engels consistently indicated this feature. However, it is precisely here that opportunism--being consistent--has gone way beyond Marx and Engels, simply accepting the bourgeois social state. Furthermore, the revolutionary immaturity and vagueness of the left wing of the Second International was also manifested in its inability to formulate the question of the state clearly.

Here again Lenin was the only one to reach the necessary theoretical understanding of Marx's concept and the purity of proletarian-revolutionary views concerning the state. Had this been his only merit, it would still be one of the highest theoretical achievements. However, having restored Marx's

theory of the state, Lenin achieved not the philological restoration of the initial doctrine or the philosophical systematization of its real principles. As in everything else, he advanced it further in the area of specific developments, in the area of current practical steps. Lenin understood and formulated the question of the state as a problem to be solved by the struggling proletariat. The objective possibility of any opportunistic misunderstanding of the extremely clear theory of the state provided by historical materialism was due to the fact that before Lenin this theory was conceived only as a general theory, as a historical, economic, philosophical, etc., interpretation of the nature of the state. It is true that Marx and Engels themselves had already seen in the specific revolutionary events of their time the real progress made in the thinking of the proletariat on the question of the state (the Commune); it is also true that they most sharply pointed out the errors which the false theories of the state introduce in the leadership of the class struggle waged by the proletariat (Critique of Gotha Program). However, even their first students, the best among the leaders of the labor movement of that time, failed to understand the interconnection between the problem of the state and their daily work. Increasingly, solving the problem of the state assumed the emphasis of some kind of "final objective" to be reached in the future.

It was only thanks to Lenin that that this "future" became the present, applicable to theory as well. It is only when the question of the state is considered a problem of daily struggle that the proletariat acquires the specific possibility of no longer considering the capitalist state as a fixed environment, as the only possible social system in its lifetime. It is only such a position toward the bourgeois state that gives the proletariat the theoretical fearlessness in terms of the state in general and raises its actions in this area to the level of purely tactical problems.

Furthermore, the Leninist analysis of the state as a weapon of the class struggle makes this question even more specific. It brings to light not only the immediate practical (tactical, ideological, etc.) consequences of the historically accurate view of the bourgeois state but also, at the same time, specifically outlines the features of the proletarian state in its organic interrelationship with the other means of struggle wielded by the proletariat. The clear need arises of setting up authorities which can encompass and lead in the struggle the entire proletariat and the broad masses of all exploited people in bourgeois society (peasants, soldiers). However, these authorities, the soviets, are, by virtue of their nature, within the framework of bourgeois society, already the authorities of the proletariat, which is becoming consolidated as a class. Even in their initial and least developed forms of 1905, the worker soviets indicated that they were a countergovernment.

The worker soviet as a state machinery is also a weapon in the class struggle waged by the proletariat. It was on the basis of the fact that the proletariat suppresses the class rule of the bourgeoisie and tries to create a classless society that the nondialectical (and, therefore, nonhistorical and nonrevolutionary) theory of opportunism reached the conclusion that the proletariat, in suppressing the class rule of the bourgeoisie, must suppress any form of class rule, for the reason that in no circumstances could its own form of rule turn into agencies of class domination and class suppression.

Abstractly speaking, this basic concept is utopian, for such type of proletarian rule can never develop. However, if we adopt a specific approach to it and apply it to our time, it means ideological surrender to the bourgeoisie. The most developed form of bourgeois democratic rule, according to this concept is, as a minimum, a form which proceeds proletarian democracy and, at most, a proletarian democracy itself which, through peaceful promotion, should merely be concerned with winning the majority of the population over on the side of the social democratic "ideals." It turns out, therefore, that the conversion from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy is not necessarily achieved in a revolutionary manner. The only revolutionary aspect is the transition from backward to democratic state forms; under certain circumstances, the need for the revolutionary defense of democracy from social reaction becomes necessary.

The meaning of such views is not only that the revolution is removed from the process of historical development which, thanks to all kinds of coarsely or finely designed transitions, a process of growing into socialism; their purpose is also to dull in the awareness of the proletariat the class nature of bourgeois democracy. The starting point of this fraud is the nondialectically interpreted concept of majority. Since it is precisely the rule of the working class that, by virtue of its very nature, represents the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population, many workers easily develop the illusion that some kind of "pure," formal democracy, which will equally take into consideration the opinion of every citizen of the state, could be the most suitable way of expressing and representing the interests of the total population. What is ignored here is the mere, only a mere! petty matter, i.e., the fact that people are by no means abstract individuals. They are not abstract atoms of some kind of state entity but that all of them, without exception, are specific people with specific positions in public production and whose social life (as reflected in their minds, and so on) is defined by this concept. The "pure" democracy of bourgeois society precisely excludes this indirect influence: it directly links the abstract individual, as such, to the state entity which, in this context, becomes just as abstract. This is the essential nature of bourgeois democracy and by virtue of this very fact bourgeois society turns out politically dispersed. This not only offers a clear advantage to the bourgeoisie but also specifically creates a decisive prerequisite for its class domination.

For there is no class domination which, based on the exercise of power, could last long only through force. As Talleyrand himself said, one could use bayonets for anything one wishes other for than sitting on them. In other words, minority rule is always organized socially in such a way as to ensure the unity of the ruling class, allowing it to act as one, while disorganizing and dividing the oppressed classes. As to the rule by a minority, such as the modern bourgeoisie, we must always bear in mind that a significant majority of the population does not belong to any of the classes which play a decisive role in the class struggle, such as the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; and that by virtue of this fact the social, the class function of "pure" democracy is to ensure the bourgeois leadership of such intermediary strata (naturally, this includes the ideological disorganization of the proletariat. The longer a democracy exists in a given country, and the "purer" the forms in which it has developed, the stronger such disorganization becomes). Naturally, in

order to achieve this objective, political democracy of this type by itself does not suffice. It merely accounts for the political top of the social system, the other units of which are the ideological separation of economics from politics, the creation of a bureaucratic state apparatus, in which a significant portion of the petite bourgeoisie is materially and morally interested in the durability of the state, a bourgeois party system, the press, the school, religion, etc. Despite such a more or less conscious division of labor, all of them pursue a single objective: to hinder the development by the oppressed population classes of an independent ideology which would express their own class interests; to link the individual members of such classes, taken separately, as individuals, as "citizens of the state," etc., to an abstract state which stands above the individual classes; to disorganize such classes as such, to disperse them and to pulverize them into atoms easily governed by the bourgeoisie.

The view that the soviets (soviets of workers, and of peasants and soldiers) are the state power of the proletariat means an attempt by the proletariat, as a leading class in the revolution, to counter this process of disorganization. First of all, it must structure itself as a class. Then, however, in precisely the same manner it must organize for such activities the active elements of the intermediary strata which instinctively rise against bourgeois domination. At the same time, it must undermine—materially and ideologically—the influence of the bourgeoisie on the remaining parts of such classes. The more intelligent among the opportunists, people such as Otto Bauer for instance, realized that the social meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the soviets, largely consist of the following: decisively depriving the bourgeoisie of the possibility of ideological leadership of such classes, particularly the peasantry, and transferring this leadership to the proletariat during the transitional period. The suppression of the bourgeoisie, the breakdown of its state apparatus, the elimination of its press, and so on, are vitally necessary for a proletarian revolution, for after suffering its initial defeats in the struggle for state power, the bourgeoisie does not abandon its efforts to regain its leading economic and political role and for a long period of time even remains the stronger class in the class struggle, a struggle which continues in the course of the thus changed circumstances.

Thus, with the help of the system of soviets, the proletariat continues the struggle for state power which it previously waged, against capitalist state power. It must economically destroy the bourgeoisie, isolate it politically, corrupt it ideologically and dominate it. At the same time, it must become the leader of the movement for freedom for all other social strata which it frees from bourgeois domination. This means that it is insufficient for the proletariat to struggle objectively for the interests of other exploited strata. Its governmental form must help to surmount the backwardness and division of such strata through education, so that they may be trained to engage in active efforts and independent participation in state life. One of the most important functions of the system of the soviets is to interconnect aspects of social life which are divided by capitalism. The soviet system steadily promotes the inseparable unity between economics and politics; it thus links directly the existence of the people and their immediate daily interests, and so on, to the decisive problems of social development as a

whole. However, it also establishes unity in objective reality where the class interests of the bourgeoisie could establish their own "division of labor:" above all between the "power machinery" (army, police, administrative apparatus, the courts, etc.) and "the people." The soviet system, in general, is aimed at comprehensively connecting human activities to general problems of state activities, economics, culture, and so on, struggling, at the same time, for the management of all such problems not to become the privilege of an exclusive bureaucratic stratum isolated from overall social life. By thus making society aware of the real interconnection among all aspects of social life (and, at a subsequent stage, objectively blending that which today is objectively separate such as, for example, town with country, mental with physical labor, etc.), the soviet system and the proletarian state become the decisive factors in the organization of the proletariat as a class. That which under the conditions of a capitalist society was only a possibility for the proletariat here becomes real; the productive energy of the proletariat can be awakened only after it has come to power. However, that which applies to the proletariat also applies to the other oppressed strata in bourgeois society. Now they can not only live in accordance with their interests but can also release their energy, which until then has been either concealed or misused. Their status as being led is manifested only in the fact that the framework and trend of their development are defined by the proletariat as the leading class in the revolution.

The position of the nonproletarian intermediary strata as being led in a proletarian state is therefore substantially different, from the material viewpoint, from their status of being led in a bourgeois society. Another important formal distinction exists as well: the proletarian state is the first in the history of a class state to proclaim openly and with no hypocrisy whatsoever that it is a class-oriented state, an apparatus of coercion, an instrument of the class struggle. It is only this extremely open nature of the state and the absence of any hypocrisy whatsoever that make possible the real reciprocal understanding between the proletariat and the other social strata. Furthermore, this is an exceptionally important means of the self-education of the proletariat. The value of the state as a weapon of the proletariat is determined by what the proletariat can achieve with its help.

The relevance of the revolution is manifested in the relevance of the problem of the state to the proletariat. At the same time, however, the proletariat faces the problem of socialism, which advances from the status of some kind of end objective and assumes the immediacy of a current problem.

VI. Revolutionary Realpolitik

The proletariat seizes as the state power and establishes its revolutionary dictatorship: this means that establishing socialism becomes an immediate item on the agenda, i.e., a problem for which the proletariat is least of all ideologically prepared. For the so-called "realpolitik" of the social democrats, which has always considered all current problems only as current or, in other words, never exceeding in practical and specific terms the boundaries of bourgeois society, has precisely by virtue of this fact presented socialism to the workers as a kind of utopia.

The superb realism with which Lenin considered all problems of socialism during the period of dictatorship (something which even his bourgeois and petit bourgeois opponents are forced respectfully to acknowledge) is, therefore, nothing other than the systematic application of Marxism and of the historical-dialectical approach to the problems of socialism which, at that point, became topical. Very little information is found about socialism as a condition in Lenin's speeches and works as, in fact, in the works of Marx. Conversely, such works discuss much more extensively the steps which could lead to its implementation. The specific understanding of socialism and the nature of socialism itself is that it is the product of the struggle which is waged for it; it is achieved only in the course of the struggle for socialism and only in the process of and as the result of this struggle. Any attempt at understanding socialism outside of this dialectical interaction with the daily problems of the class struggle leads to metaphysics, utopia, to something purely contemplative rather than practical.

Lenin's realism and his "realpolitik" mean, consequently, the definitive elimination of any kind of utopianism. They mean a specific implementation of Marx's program: to give practice a theory. In terms of socialism Lenin did exactly what he did in terms of the problem of the state: he pulled it out of its former metaphysical isolation, saved it from bourgeoisification and included it in the general interconnection among problems of the class struggle. He used the specific materials of the historical process to test the brilliant stipulations provided by Marx in "Critique of the Gotha Program" and other works. He made more specific and historically more real the process than was possible in Marx's times, even for a genius such as Marx.

Therefore, the problems of socialism are problems of economic structure and class relations which exist at a time when the proletariat assumes the power of the state. They proceed directly from the situation in which the proletariat establishes its dictatorship.

What were the specific, the real circumstances which the Russian proletariat, assuming power, had to face in order to establish a socialist system? First, there was a relatively developed monopoly capitalism, which was collapsing as a result of the World War, existing in a backward peasant country, in which the peasantry could free itself from the fetters of feudal vestiges only as a result of a proletarian revolution. Second, outside Russia, there was a hostile capitalist encirclement, ready to hurl itself on the newly emerged state of workers and peasants, using all means at its disposal, an encirclement which would have been sufficiently strong to suppress this state economically and militarily if it had not been itself torn apart by ever aggravating contradictions within imperialist capitalism, something which has always enabled the proletariat to make use to its advantage of this rivalry and of similar circumstances.

It is only the restructuring of industry, reaching a higher level in its development, its adaptation to the needs of the toiling classes and its reorganization in the spirit of the increasingly reinterpreted new type of life (elimination of disparities between town and country and between mental and physical labor, and so on) that could provide the material foundations for socialism as a superior economic form replacing capitalism. The status of

this material foundation for socialism determines the possibilities and ways of its specific implementation. Here again, as early as 1917, before the assumption of state power, Lenin clearly defined the economic status and the tasks stemming from it for the proletariat. "The dialectics of history is precisely such that the war, which inordinately accelerated the conversion of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism, brought mankind inordinately closer to socialism.

"The imperialist war marks the eve of the socialist revolution. This is not only because war, with its horrors, leads to a proletarian uprising, for no uprising can lead to socialism unless socialism has become economically ripe, but because state-monopoly capitalism constitutes the fullest possible material preparation for socialism. It is the threshold of socialism. It is that rung on the historical ladder between which and the step known as socialism no intermediary rungs exist" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 193). Consequently, "socialism is nothing other than state-capitalist monopoly converted in such a way as to benefit the entire people, for it is no longer a capitalist monopoly" (Ibid., p 192). At the beginning of 1918, Lenin wrote: "...State capitalism would have been a step forward compared to the present state of affairs in our Soviet Republic. If, let us say, 6 months later state capitalism had been established in our country, this would have been a tremendous success and the best possible guarantee of the fact that 1 year later socialism would become definitively strong and invincible in our country" (op cit., vol 36, p 295).

It was necessary to mention this in particular detail in order to refute the bourgeois and social democratic legend according to which, after the failure of the "doctrinary Marxist" attempt at establishing communism "immediately," guided by some kind of "real-political wisdom," Lenin is said to have reached some kind of compromise and abandoned his initial political line. The historical truth indicates precisely the opposite. The so-called war communism, which Lenin considered a temporary measure caused by the civil war and the dislocation, and which "neither was nor could be consistent with the economic tasks of proletarian policy" (op cit., vol 43, p 220) was a deviation from the line along which, in accordance with his theoretical prediction, development toward socialism takes place. Naturally, this was determined by the civil war inside and outside the country and, perhaps, an inevitable yet nonetheless temporary step. According to Lenin, however, in the case of the revolutionary proletariat it would have been fatally mistaken to assess this nature of war communism and to consider it, like many honest revolutionaries, who had not reached Lenin's theoretical level, believed, a real step toward socialism.

Consequently, it is not a question of how sharply the external forms of economic life manifest their socialist nature but the extent to which the proletariat is able actually to master the handling of the economic apparatus which it appropriates as it comes to power, and which is also the foundation for its social life, i.e., large-scale industry, and the extent to which it is able in fact to apply the mastery of this apparatus to its class objectives. However greatly the surrounding circumstances in which these class objectives exist may have changed and, respectively, the means to achieve them, their common foundation must remain one and the same: to lead the constantly

fluctuating middle strata (the peasantry in particular) along the decisive front, the front which opposes the bourgeoisie, and to continue to wage the class struggle. In this case as well we must never forget that despite its initial victory, the proletariat nonetheless remains the weaker class and will remain such for a long time, until the victory of the revolution on a universal scale. Economically, it must direct its struggle, therefore, on the basis of two principles: on the one hand, the extent to which it is possible rapidly and completely to block the dislocation of large-scale industry, triggered by the world and civil wars, for without such a foundation the proletariat would perish as a class; on the other, to regulate all production and distribution problems in such a way that through the maximally possible satisfaction of the material interests of the peasantry, which has become the ally of the proletariat as a result of the revolutionary resolution of the agrarian problem, to preserve its alliance with it. The means used to achieve such objectives change according to circumstances. Their gradual implementation, however, is the only way to maintain proletarian rule, which is the prime prerequisite for socialism.

All of this means that the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is continuing on the domestic economic front unabatedly. Small-scale production, the elimination and socialization of which, at that stage, is pure utopianism, "constantly generates capitalism and the bourgeoisie, on a daily, hourly and spontaneous basis, and on a mass scale" (op cit., vol 41, p 6). The question is who will win in this struggle: the newly established, the newly accumulating bourgeoisie or large-scale industry owned by the proletariat. The proletariat must dare to engage in such a struggle in order to avoid the risk of breaking up its alliance with the peasantry for a long time by frustrating small-scale production, trade, and so on (which, as it were, could not be achieved anyway). Furthermore, the bourgeoisie joins in the struggle in the form of concessions, foreign capital, etc. At this point a paradoxical situation appears, for such an inclusion, regardless of intentions, by virtue of objective economic laws could become an ally of the proletariat, for it strengthens the economic power of big industry. An alliance develops against petty-production elements. Naturally, on the other hand, the natural aspiration of concessionary capital gradually to convert the proletarian state into a capitalist colony has been firmly suppressed (concessionary conditions, foreign trade monopoly, etc.).

Naturally, these brief remarks lay no claim to depicting Lenin's economic policy even in its most basic features. All that we have said here is merely an illustration of highlighting the principles governing Lenin's policy and its theoretical foundation. These principles are as follows: to preserve the domination of the proletariat, surrounded by a world of overt and covert enemies and uncertain allies, at all cost. This follows precisely the same principle as the one, prior to the assumption of power, which was to find in the whirlpool of crisscrossing social trends of declining capitalism features, the use of which would allow the proletariat to rise to the position of the leading, the ruling class in society. Lenin's greatness as a dialectician is that he always looked at the basic principles of dialectics and development of production process and the class struggle, seeing their most profound inner nature, specifically, without an abstract prejudice or any fetishistic distortion caused by phenomena on their surface; he invariably reduced all

phenomena he came across to their profound essence: specific actions by specific (i.e., class-motivated) individuals, on the basis of their real class interests. It is precisely this principle that defeats the legend of Lenin as a "wise realistic politician," and as "master of compromises." We therefore see in front of us the true Lenin, the consistent creator of Marxist dialectics.

In defining the concept of compromise itself, we must immediately reject any attempt at seeing in it the idea that it is a question of some kind of tricks or traps or refined means of gaining unearned advantages. The compromises made by Lenin and those made by the opportunists proceed from directly opposite postulates. Deliberately or subconsciously, the tactics of the social democrats are based on the fact that the revolution itself is still far into the future, that for the time being no objective prerequisites for a social revolution exist, that the proletariat is not yet ideologically mature for revolution, that the party and the trade unions are still too weak, etc., precisely for which reason the proletariat should compromise with the bourgeoisie.

Conversely, to Lenin a compromise stems directly and logically from the relevance of the revolution. If the basic nature of an entire age consists of the relevance of the revolution; if such a revolution can break out at any moment and in any individual country or on a world-wide scale, and if this moment can never be accurately predicted; and if the revolutionary nature of an entire age is manifested in the steadily growing breakdown of bourgeois society, the inevitable consequence of which is an endless change and crisscrossing of a great variety of trends, what all of this means is that the proletariat could start and carry out its revolution not during "favorable" circumstances it has chosen itself, and that in accordance with this factor, any trend, even though transient, which could contribute to the revolution or, at least, weaken its enemies, should be used by the proletariat whatever the circumstances. Lenin's theory and tactics of compromises is nothing other than the logical consequence of the very essence of the Marxist, the dialectical understanding of history, according to which the people, although they make their own history cannot, however, make it under circumstances they have chosen. The revolution is the consequence of the understanding of the fact that history is always creating something new and, therefore, the fact that such historical moments and brief convergence of trends will never be repeated in the same form and that today we could assess as favorable for the revolution trends whose development tomorrow may create a mortal threat to it, and vice versa.

The extent to which the entire Leninist theory of compromise is based on Lenin's deep belief in the relevance of the revolution is confirmed by the theoretical struggle he waged against the left wing of his own party (after the first revolution and after the Brest peace on the scale of Russia and, in 1920 and 1929, on the scale of Europe). In all such debates left-wing radicalism rejected all compromise out of hand. Lenin's argument is essentially based on the fact that the rejection of compromise means an aspiration to avoid decisive battles and that this view is based on defeatism in terms of the revolution. For a true revolutionary situation, and as far as Lenin was concerned, it was the main feature of our age, is manifested in the

fact that there neither is nor could there be an area of the class struggle in which there are no revolutionary (or counterrevolutionary) opportunities. Consequently, the true revolutionary, i.e., the man who is aware of the fact that we are living in a revolutionary age and who draws practical conclusions from this understanding, must always consider from this viewpoint the overall picture of sociohistorical reality and, in the interest of the revolution, firmly take everything into consideration: the most significant and the most insignificant features, the ordinary and the extraordinary, always assessing the extent of its importance to the revolution and acting only on the basis of such positions. By describing left-wing radicalism as left-wing opportunism, Lenin quite accurately and profoundly noted the overall historical future of such opposite trends, one of which rejects all compromise while the other considers that a compromise means the application of the "realpolitik" principle in contrast to the "rigid observance of dogmatic principles." What unites them is their pessimism concerning the immediacy and relevance of the proletarian revolution. The very fact that Lenin rejects both trends, guided by the same principle, makes it clear that the only thing in common between Lenin's compromise and that of the opportunists is the use of the same word which, however, applies to basically different realities and, therefore, has entirely different meanings.

The accurate understanding of what Lenin meant by compromise and the way he theoretically substantiated the tactics of compromise are not only of basic significance in the accurate use of his method but also of exceptional importance from the practical viewpoint. According to Lenin, a compromise is possible only in a dialectical interaction with the observance of Marxist principles and methods; the compromise always highlights the next real step in the implementation of Marxist theory. In precisely the same way that this theory and tactics are drastically different from the automatically sluggish observance of "pure" principles, they must be strictly separated from any kind of unprincipled schematizing "realpolitik." This means that, according to Lenin, it is insufficient properly to understand and evaluate a specific situation in which an action, a specific correlation of forces takes place, which determines the need for compromise and the trends of inevitable subsequent development of the proletarian movement based on this trend in its present aspect. Lenin considers such an accurate understanding of an existing status outside the framework of the accurate understanding of the overall historical process as constituting a tremendous practical danger to the labor movement.

The dialectically accurate combination of the general with the specific, the identification of the general (i.e., the general basic historical trend) within the specific (i.e., within a specific situation) and the consequent concretizing of theory are, therefore, the basic ideas of this theory of compromises. Those who consider Lenin as being merely a wise or even a brilliant supporter of "realpolitik" totally fail to understand the very essence of his method. However, those who hope to find in his decisions comprehensively applicable "prescriptions" and "recipes" for accurate action equally fail to understand him. Lenin never set "universal rules" "suitable for application" in all different circumstances. His "truths" stem from the specific analysis of a specific situation, based on a dialectical understanding of history. The result of a mechanical "summation" of his

instructions or decisions may only be a caricature, a kind of vulgar Leninism. As Marx wrote in sharply blaming Lassalle for a misuse of the dialectical method, "Hegel never described as dialectics the classification of a mass of 'accidents' as belonging to a common principle" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 30, p 168).

The consideration of all trends found in one specific situation or another does not mean, however, that such trends are equally important in decision making. On the contrary, each situation has a main problem which determines the solution of all other problems which appear along with it, as well as the further development of all social trends in the future. "One must be able," Lenin wrote, "to find at each specific time that special link in the chain which must be grabbed with all our strength in order to keep together the entire chain and to prepare a firm transition to the next link. The order in which the links are placed, their form and their coupling, their distinction from each other in the historical chain of events are not so simple or stupid as would be the case with an ordinary chain forged by a blacksmith" (op cit., vol 36, p 205). The precise aspect of social life which assumes particular importance can be determined only through Marxist dialectics, through a specific analysis of a specific situation. The guideline in such a search is the revolutionary view on society as being an entity in motion. For it is only such an attitude toward the entity that may ascribe this kind of significance to a specific decisive link in the chain: we must clutch it, for it is only this that will hold the entity together. Lenin raises this question particularly sharply and specifically again in one of his last works, in which he speaks of cooperation and indicates that "a great deal of what was fantastic and even romantic or even trite in the dreams of the old cooperators becomes the most unadorned reality" (op cit., vol 45, p 369). He writes: "Strictly speaking, 'all' that remains for us to do is to make our population so 'civilized' that it may understand all the advantages of comprehensive participation in cooperating with and organizing such participation. This was 'all.' At this point we need no other subtleties to convert to socialism. However, in order to accomplish this 'all,' we need a full turn of events, an entire period of cultural development of the entire mass of people" (Ibid., p 372). Unfortunately, we do not have the possibility to analyze this entire work in detail. Such an analysis, as well as the analysis of any tactical instruction issued by Lenin, would indicate the manner in which the entire entity could be found within each "link in the chain." It would indicate that the criterion of accurate Marxist policy is always to single out in a process aspects on which to concentrate maximal energy and which, within a specific segment of time and a specific phase include this relationship to the whole, the entire picture of our time and the central problem of the development of the future, i.e., in reference to a future in its practically foreseeable integrality. Such an energetic hold of the closest and decisive link of the chain does not mean in the least, naturally, that this aspect is removed from the overall picture and, in turn, that other aspects are therefore ignored. Conversely, it means that all other aspects connected to the central problem will be properly understood in this connection and resolved. The interconnection among all problems is not only not broken with such an approach but, conversely, becomes even stronger and more specific. The historical process and the development of production forces are what separates these aspects. However, it depends on the proletariat itself whether or not

it will be capable, and the extent to which it will be capable, of understanding and mastering them and thus influencing their further development. The fundamental (repeatedly mentioned here) concept of Marxism to the effect that the people themselves make their history acquires, in the age of revolution and after the assumption of state power, a permanently growing significance (although, naturally, this does not lower its dialectical development--the significance of circumstances independent of the human will). In practical terms, this means that the role of the party in the revolution--which is the young Lenin's great idea--becomes even more decisive in the period of conversion to socialism than in the period of preparations for revolution. For the stronger the influence of the proletariat, which determines the course of history, becomes, and the more its decisions determine the fate--for better or for worse--its own and that of all mankind, the more important it becomes to preserve the cleanliness and accuracy of the only compass in this tempestuously raging sea--the class awareness of the proletariat--and the more important it becomes to develop an ever growing clarity of this spirit, of this, the only important guide in the struggle. Such an understanding of the significance of the active historical role of the party of the proletariat is the basic feature of Lenin's theory and, therefore, politics, to which he tirelessly drew attention and the importance of which he emphasized in terms of practical decision making.

Therefore, each turning point in the development of socialism always and decisively is the inner problem of the party. It means the need for regrouping forces and adapting the party organizations to the new task, that of influencing the development of society in the spirit dictated by the thorough and precise analysis of the overall picture from the class viewpoint of the proletariat. Therefore, in the gradation of the decisive forces of the state, which is us, the party stands on the highest rung of the ladder. A mechanical rigid thinking inherent in all supporters of opportunistic and bourgeois ideology will always see in such interrelationships insoluble contradictions. They are unable to understand why, having "returned to capitalism," the bolsheviks nonetheless retain their old party structure and previous "nondemocratic" party dictatorship. They are unable to understand why the Communist International does not abandon even for a minute the idea of a world revolution but, conversely, tries with all means at its disposal, to prepare and organize it, while the state of the Russian proletariat tries to organize peace in relations with the imperialist countries and contributes to the maximally possible participation of imperialist capitalism in Russia's economic development. They are unable to understand why the party inflexibly preserves its inner strictness and most decisively strengthens its ideological and organizational unity while in pursuing its economic policy, the Soviet Republic scrupulously tries not to violate its alliance with the peasantry to which it owes its existence, although in the eyes of the opportunists the Soviet Republic is increasingly turning into a peasant state, increasingly losing its proletarian nature, and so on, and so forth. Such mechanically rigid and nondialectical thinking is unable to understand that such contradictions are objectively existing contradictions of our age and that the policy of the RKP(b), the policy of Lenin, is contradictory only to the extent to which it seeks and finds proper answers to objective contradictions within its own social existence.

Therefore, the study of Lenin's policy invariably takes us back to the basic problems of the dialectical method. All of Lenin's activities are a systematic application of Marxist dialectics to the constantly changing and constantly arising new phenomena in the great transitional age. However, since dialectics is not a ready-made theory which can be mechanically applied to the phenomena of life, and since in this application and through this application it exists as a theory, the dialectical method came out of Lenin's practical efforts broader, more complete in terms of content and more developed theoretically than when Lenin inherited it from Marx and Engels.

That is why it is entirely accurate to speak of Leninism as a new phase in the development of dialectical materialism. Lenin not only restored the purity of the Marxist doctrine after all the simplifications and distortions promoted by vulgar Marxism in the course of decades, but also ensured the further development of the Marxist method itself, concretizing it and making it more mature. And since the task of the communists is go forth on the Leninist way, this progress may be fruitful only if they address themselves to Lenin the way Lenin addressed himself to Marx. Leninism means that the theory of historical materialism has come even closer to the daily struggle waged by the proletariat and has become even more practical than it could have been during Marx's times. That is why the tradition of Leninism is only that of protecting it from all distortions and misrepresentations and to preserve this live and life-bearing, this growing function of historical materialism which must develop. Therefore, we repeat, the communists must study Lenin the way Lenin studied Marx. They must study him in such a way as to be able to make use of the dialectical method and learn how to find, with the help of a specific analysis of specific situation, the specific features in the general and the general features in the specific; at each new aspect of a situation they must determine what it is that links it to the preceding process and, in accordance with the laws of the historical process, what links it with the steadily developing new aspects; they must find in the entity specific parts and in a specific part the entity; they must find in inevitable developments the aspect of active action and, in a specific action, its link with the laws of the historical process. Leninism means an unparalleled degree of specific, nonschematic, nonmechanical, direct aspiration to practical thinking. Its preservation is, precisely, the task of the Leninists. However, the only thing that can be preserved in the historical process is that which lives and develops. Such preservation of the traditions of Leninism is today the prime task of anyone who seriously accepts the dialectical method as a weapon in the class struggle of the proletariat.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

MAN--TECHNOLOGY--NATURE. ROUNDTABLE OF THE JOURNALS 'KOMMUNIST' and 'NOWE DROGI'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 81-89

[Text] At the beginning of March 1987 a joint theoretical conference (roundtable) was held by the editors of NOWE DROGI and KOMMUNIST in Zaboruwe, a picturesque suburb of Warsaw. The topic of the meeting was "Scientific and Technical Progress and the Role of the Human Factor." This conference, which was organized within the framework of interparty ideological cooperation between the CPSU and the PZPR, brought together party workers, scientists and journalists from Poland and the USSR. The range of specialized fields represented in this roundtable meeting was quite broad and nontraditional: philosophy, mathematics, biology, psychology, political economy, sociology, history and computers.

Naturally, the topic of the discussion gave the conference its name. However, it also included a slogan which was formulated more energetically and the purpose of which was to promote an intensive exchange of views: "Man-Science-Humanism." It is true that in opening the conference, S. Wronski, editor in chief of NOWE DROGI, the journal of the PZPR Central Committee, noted that the preliminary study of the topics of the papers submitted by the participants made it possible to choose more precise words with which to express the "man-technology-nature" slogan. The proceedings of the conference confirmed the accuracy of this specification, although the humanistic aspects of the problems under discussion were not ignored by anyone among the participants in the discussion. A comparison among the concepts of "man-technology-nature" brings to light a great deal of very crucial contradictions existing at the present stage in the development of mankind as a whole, of individual countries and nations, classes and social groups. The question on which the conference focused was how to surmount, how to solve such contradictions on the basis of our Marxist-Leninist ideals. Naturally, the conference could not provide an exhaustive answer. However, the exchange of views enriched the participants with new knowledge and a deeper understanding of the nature of the problems and the respective views. It provided a good incentive for the creative interpretation of the problems and the study of social practices.

Our survey (prepared by A. Antipov, KOMMUNIST science and education department editor, who attended the conference), is not a documentary protocol of the

discussions but an effort to share the strongest impressions from the debate. The conference offered extensive opportunities to this effect.

Humanistic Aspects of Progress and Global Problems of Our Time

At least four of the 5 billion people alive today will live to see the year 2000 and more than half of them, the year 2030. The absolute majority of the children born in 1987 will see personally the world as it will be in the middle of the next century. However, it will a world that they will make. We bear responsibility to our children and grandchildren for the vector, the trend in the development of civilization which it obtains today.

This vector has a number of dimensions. Any one of them makes sense under the following condition: mankind must survive. Civilization must not perish in a thermonuclear fire; this prerequisite is the most global of all problems.

In the study of global problems, contemporary researchers have suggested various ways of classifying them, and drawn up a variety of lists. I. Maletskiy, for example, member of the Polish Academy of Science, singles out 14 problems of global importance. However, as was emphasized by the participants in the conference, any Marxist would start this list with the problem of the survival of mankind in the nuclear missile age, the problem of war and peace.

The need to solve global problems, for which there are no political, geographic or any other boundaries, is related to the most important theoretical problem of the priority of universal values and interests, as was emphasized by M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with men of world culture, with the participants of the Issyk-Kul Forum, on 20 October 1986.

The profound interpretation of this concept by the social scientists and its further development under contemporary conditions should clearly indicate the universal meaning of Marxism, said E. Arab-Ogly, member of the editorial collegium of KOMMUNIST and doctor of philosophical sciences. The interests of civilization on earth do not conflict with those of the working class, whose historical mission is the creation of a classless society.

The social progress of mankind depends on the solution of global problems. However, the opposite is equally true: success in solving crucial, truly topical global problems depends on progress achieved in relations among countries and nations, among classes and social groups. The peoples of the world and the broadest possible social circles must master a new way of thinking consistent with the nature of such problems. However difficult may be the questions which arise on the nature of the new style of thinking and on how to develop it in the young generation and how teach the adults how to think in a new style, it is unquestionable that a nuclear war is inadmissible and that any step which reduces the threat of war is a step toward progress, and that, although conflicting, the world today is interdependent and largely integral.

"The communists have always known that social progress is extremely complex and contradictory," the 27th CPSU Congress noted. "However, the main

distinction of the communist outlook is that it invariably puts man, with his interests and concerns, in the center of such processes. Human life and the possibility of its comprehensive development," V.I. Lenin emphasized, "is the greatest value and the interests of social development stand above all else."

Marxist philosophy must analyze the ways of social progress while, at the same time, constructively solve global contradictions which exclude military confrontation, said at the conference Professor S. Opara, editor in chief of the journal *MYSL MARXISTOWSKA*. This philosophy, which is responsive to our time, must be addressed more to the future than to the past. In an unprecedented situation the importance of historical experience becomes limited and frequently requires a critical reinterpretation. History, which is so frequently interpreted as the history of wars, must caution us against one final military catastrophe. We must abandon the paradigm beloved by historians, in the light of which war is presented as a more significant, a more active moment in history, as a crucible in which changes are smelted, as a result of which new political and social structures arise from a sea of sacrifices. Usually textbooks describe peace times briefly, and the personalities of peace time pale compared to those of military leaders, fighters, armed heroes and their battles. We must reconsider this picture. We must shed light on the ideological motivations of people in times of peace and on their thoughts and actions. We must depict the economic and historical infrastructure of the world and create a philosophy of history imbued with the ideas of peace. As we know, the founders of Marxism rejected the "theory of violence." We must enrich and reinterpret the concept of peace not as a break between wars, as some kind of "no-war" condition, but as the historically most fruitful form of social existence.

Warsaw University Professor M. Dobroselski recalled M.S. Gorbachev's statement at the meeting with the participants of the Moscow Forum "On a Nuclear-Free World and For the Survival of Mankind," of 16 February 1987: "The militarization of thinking and way of life weakens and even totally eliminates the moral hindrance on the way to nuclear suicide. Today international relations have lost their spirit because of the cult of force and militarization. Hence the task of humanizing international relations." The concept of comprehensive international security, formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress, and the steps taken by the Soviet Union to ensure its practical implementation are impressive demonstrations of a new style of thinking, including in the area of politics.

What is especially new and important in the concept of comprehensive security? the speaker asked. It is a vision and view of the world as a single entity, despite various opposite trends and contradictions, difficult alternatives, concerns and hopes. It means a complete understanding of the fact that a number of global problems and crises exist which can be solved only through dialogue and cooperation and not through conflicts and confrontations. It means a priority of long-term interests of all mankind and of its common basic values, compared to the immediate interests of a given country, class or ideology. The problem of comprehensive international security is considered the main global problem which can be solved only jointly, through cooperation among all or most countries in the world, through dialogue and political means and not through an arms race or a policy "from a position of strength."

In our days the concepts of "war" and "progress" have become absolutely incompatible. Paradoxically, the opinion is still widespread that the war industry creates exceptionally favorable conditions and opportunities for scientific and technical development. War production yields goods essentially aimed at self-destruction, not to mention the fact that their main objective is to kill people, without any guarantees whatsoever that the end result would be to the advantage of the aggressor, as has been the case in previous "profitable" wars of aggression. Polish Academy of Sciences Professor Yu. Lipets (Krakow) said that anything which serves war on a global scale must be unconditionally and irreversibly removed from the balance of the possibilities of progress of all human civilizations and individual nations. Military spin-offs in technological developments are social dead-end streets, he went on to say. Similar and ever more clearly identifiable dangers are related to the degradation of the environment caused by thoughtless and predatory economic management. The theory of the comprehensive humanistic assessment of the sum total of produced values (and antivalues!) is only now beginning to be developed. Great opportunities exist in this area for Marxism, as a science armed with the most necessary instrument, dialectics. Scientific theory has the duty of identifying contradictions in scientific and technical progress and finding ways of solving them.

When we hear claims that science has nurtured contemporary militarism we must not forget that the achievements of science, embodied in technology, are neutral in terms of higher values. They could be used to strengthen social justice as well as to preserve oceans of need with tiny islands of luxury. They could be sources of well-being and blossoming of civilization as well as means of war and causes of ecological catastrophes. More than ever before today the contribution of science to safeguarding peace and to solving global problems could be greater and should steadily increase. N. Moiseyev, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, illustrated these opportunities with several examples, one of which made a particularly strong impression.

The contemporary level of software and computers has made it possible to build mathematical models and to develop a corresponding mathematical apparatus with the help of which we can analyze the development of conflicts, depending on the objectives of the involved parties. Such models are based on the assumption that by the end of the 20th century all people on earth, all countries in the world will have adopted as their common objective the preservation of life on earth. The existence of a common objective within an entire range of other contradictory objectives qualitatively changes the nature of the conflict situation. It stops being antagonistic (in the mathematical sense antagonism means that the objectives of one of the sides are the precise opposite of those of the other: that what is good for one of the sides is bad for the other). In such a situation mutually profitable compromises are possible, in the course of which the individual sides, which have achieved a compromise, find it unprofitable to violate assumed obligations. Finding a compromise in the complex fabric of objectives and interests is an exceptionally difficult problem. Science, equipped with special models and methods, helps to solve it.

In the past 10 to 15 years several conflict situations have been studied, encompassing a wide range of ecological problems. An abstract model was even

developed of the arms race. All situations under consideration indicated the existence of mutually profitable and even "optimal" compromises. The only prerequisite is the existence of an important joint objective. This leads to the assumption that today we can include in the agenda the creation of "agreement institutions," which would consist of international groups of competent specialists who can study conflict situations and suggest compromise options and mutually profitable and jointly adopted agreements. Let us hope that in this age of drastically worsening ecological situation such "agreement institutions" will replace the customary confrontation and efforts to solve contradictions with the help of force, at someone else's expense.

Humanism does not mean naive optimism. To be a humanist does not mean to ignore evil, injustice, stupidity and poverty which are the results of the activities of man, S. Opara said at the conference. Socialist humanism has sometimes been defined as real humanism, for it links the development of the human individual with the restructuring of social conditions and the elimination of oppression and of economic sources of inequality and humiliation. From this viewpoint the program of the socialist revolution is a program of real humanism. As a rule, violations of the values of humanism have also been violations of socialism.

Several decades ago, when nuclear weapons which could destroy life on earth began to be stockpiled, a new and clear criterion of real humanism appeared. The traditional aspiration of socialism for peace became a source of hope for the salvation of human civilization. The struggle for peace became a global problem and a dramatic criterion of practical humanism.

Scientific and Technical Progress and Man

It is not precious metals, petroleum or even soil fertility and fresh water, however necessary they may be, that are the most precious of all natural resources at the disposal of society, but the human intellect, the inexhaustible creative capabilities of the people and their inventiveness and enterprise. This thought, expressed by E. Arab-Ogly, drew the attention of the participants in the roundtable meeting. Actually, the human intellect has always been and remains irreplaceable even when (and if) an artificial intelligence will be developed on the basis of a supercomputer. Embodied in the achievements of scientific and technical progress, the power of our intellect proved comparable to geological processes; man went beyond the planet and undertook the conquest of space. It is precisely these circumstances which entrust mankind with the tremendous moral, social and even planetary responsibility for safeguarding life on earth. The topical task of our time is to be profoundly aware of this responsibility and to be guided by it on all levels of social life without exception.

Today the role of the human factor is enhanced not only in connection with restructuring and the energetic accomplishments of socialism. It would be useful to consider this process more broadly, for mankind as a whole is currently passing through a most responsible stage of development. V. Zinchenko, USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences corresponding member and doctor of psychological sciences, recalled the definition of the human factor as given in the CPSU Central Committee decree on the journal KOMMUNIST: the

human factor is the "organic unity between consciousness and activity; the need for scientific and technical progress of the universal worker and the communist ideal of the comprehensively developed individual; it is the human intellect as the most important of all social resources; it is the determination of all human capabilities and possibilities, as the motive force and highest objective of social progress." This nontraditional interpretation of the human factor is radically different from its ordinary interpretation as found in sciences dealing with labor activeness in recent decades, the speaker noted. According to this description, the human factor includes activity, awareness, personality, intellect and human capabilities, i.e., in Marx's words, all essential forces of man. The main one is that man is considered not only a motive force but also the supreme objective of social progress.

All of this is most directly related to the problems of the professional and psychological training of scientific and technical cadres. From the viewpoint of the new interpretation of the human factor, man is not little cog, a component of a more or less extensive and complex technical or sociotechnical system. He is not the passer of information. He is not a blind and thoughtless performer, he is not a transmission cog in various activities or an instrument or impersonal resource of a machine which performs and, naturally, could perform more or less successfully all such functions. The traditional interpretation of the human factor concentrated on a kind of "consumerist" attitude toward man and his possibilities and capabilities. This view of man resembles the consumer attitude toward nature which was widespread a while back. This led to the fact that ecology became a global contemporary problem. It would be no exaggeration to say that the human factor, understood in its new and more meaningful interpretation, becomes a global social problem. It is true that this has still not been realized and interpreted to an adequate extent. The frequency with which the term "human factor" is used is not in the least equivalent to the level of the true awareness of its role in reconstruction and in the further development of society.

True awareness of this role requires a change in thinking. It requires the shaping of a new way of thinking about man and the human being, about human activities. In the same way that the task of shaping a new ecological thinking is formulated, we must shape the new social and psychological way of thinking within the context of which man should be considered an active character, a thinking being, a subject of conscious, expedient and purposeful activities. Unquestionably, models of such thinking exist. K. Marx provided a most profound description of free labor: "Truly free labor such as, for example, the work of a composer is, nonetheless, a devilishly serious matter, requiring a most intensive stress. In material production labor could assume such a nature only providing that: 1. It is of a public type; 2. Labor is of a scientific nature and, at the same time, is universal, representing the effort of man not somehow to train the forces of nature but as a subject which acts in the production process not in its purely natural and naturally developed aspects but as an activity controlling all forces of nature" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op cit., vol 46, part II, p 110).

In the age of the scientific and technical revolution the task of designing and organizing precisely such forms of free labor activity becomes

increasingly topical. In itself, as Marx said, this is devilishly difficult and important. This should be the base on which social practice proceeds, including the training and teaching system in both higher and secondary schools. This should also be the base of scientific and technical policy which, in our country, is still largely exercised independently of social policy. Unfortunately, the widespread technocratic approaches to equipment design and to organizing production and management are still being eliminated extremely slowly. Chernobyl was a frightening symptom; the true reason was the separation or, in milder terms, the relative independence of scientific and technical from social policy. The punishment, however harsh, cannot alone eliminate this reason. This sets in its full magnitude the task of restructuring the mentality, awareness and way of thinking. This is related to the reform of secondary and higher education, upgrading cadre skills, restructuring the management mechanism, and so on.

The role of the human factor becomes particularly important in the future development of the scientific and technical revolution, for the latter not only introduces quality changes in the production forces, which is related to the use of new sources of energy, technology and systems for managing production processes, but also develops a new type of worker, unlike, let us say, the 19th century industrial revolution, said Professor T. Jaroszewski, department head at the Polish Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Sociology. Marx himself predicted the type of historical stage in material production in which the all-round individual development of the producer will coincide with the maximal growth of productive social labor forces. This stage could come during the productive period of today's young generation.

Computerization and robotization are already eliminating the most primitive "partial labor," which consists of several most simple and monotonous physical operations and stereotyped mental work. At the same time, we are witnessing increased demand for highly skilled labor of an engineering and technical nature. Under this situation upgrading the skill of workers, expanding their knowledge on the laws of nature and freeing their creative imagination should be considered among the most important production reserves. The all-round development of the personality becomes not only the humane objective but also a mandatory prerequisite for intensive economic development.

At the present stage in material production, one of the most efficient means of perfecting production forces is the identification and encouragement of capabilities, talents, and the creative thinking and creative activities of people and enhancing their standards and moral responsibility or, in short, direct "capital investments in man." The economics of growth increasingly predetermines the "human capital" and not only the accumulation of basic production assets.

In speaking of the need for and profitability of "investments in man," we must point out the need for such "investments" to develop a feeling of duty and moral standards in the workers, the speaker emphasized. The automation of technological processes increases their responsibility for operating exceptionally complex and, as a rule, very expensive technical systems and equipment. However, it is not merely a question of cost. The knowledgeable handling of such equipment determines the safety, health and even life of

hundreds of thousands of people in the immediate surroundings, the state of the environment, and so on. Under these circumstances there are no "technologically neutral" professional skills, mind, and ability to act knowledgeably under unexpected situations; this also requires moral qualities on the part of the worker.

Despite the unquestionable importance of the human factor, however, scientific and technical progress must be achieved also through efficient organization of the economy. Unfortunately, the possibilities which potentially exist in the socialist production method are still being poorly used in the USSR and in Poland. The participants in the conference noted that the success of the economic reform initiated in the Soviet Union will be of tremendous international importance. "In the final account, labor productivity is the most important, the main feature in ensuring the victory of the new social system," V.I. Lenin wrote as early as 1919 ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 21). The duty of the social scientists, of economists above all, is thoroughly to analyze social practices and to suggest the type of economic management mechanism in which the concept of applying the achievements of scientific and technical progress would become built-in. The socialist production process must absorb and draw within itself the achievements of basic and applied science, said S. (Dzyamski), professor at A. Mickiewicz University.

R. Kulikowski, member of the Polish Academy of Sciences and director of the Institute of Systemic Research, related the possibility of substantially accelerating the development of the socialist economy above all to successes in microelectronics. Here as well, however, the full utilization of the potential of computerization requires efforts by no means limited to the production of the necessary equipment. No computer can solve any somewhat significant problem without the active participation of an educated and intelligent person. That is why the closest possible attention must be paid to the education and upbringing of modern-thinking people and, as a result, the establishment of close cooperation among people working in the natural, technical and humanitarian sciences. It is also important to organize close scientific and technical cooperation within the framework of the socialist community, he emphasized.

Today, however, we must consider education and upbringing in a way entirely different from 20 or 30 years ago. Until only recently the life of the individual seemed somehow divided into two parts: the first period was attending school, technical school or VUZ; the second was work. During their training, people usually did not participate in productive labor and in the course of production activities they did not study, nor was there any particular need for it. Having become a turner or machine operator, for example, a person could (and usually did) spend his entire time operating a machine tool, a locomotive engine, and so on. Today the situation has changed radically. Fast changes in technology demand of the people to do productive work while they learn and to learn while they work. This was the topic of S. Kovalev, professor at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

Therefore, for the first time in history, every person faces the absolutely necessary task of continuing his education. This is particularly urgent in

the case of engineering and technical workers and specialists in various economic and cultural areas. Otherwise they may prove unable successfully to implement their immediate functions of promoters of scientific and technical progress.

One of the main prerequisites of self-education is accurate time budgeting. What possibilities exist in this connection, considering the high pace which characterizes our lives? Properly handling one's time means, above all, making skillful use of our leisure time. This is the main reserve of socialist society, which means improving services, public catering, mechanization of household labor and a shorter work day. Leisure time means "the time at one's disposal." It averages 4.6 hours per day for workers and employees, 5.2 hours for engineering and technical personnel and 2.4-3.5 hours for agricultural workers. The total amount of leisure time for the country's population (over 12 years of age) is about 21 percent, which exceeds the percentage of time spent in public production (16.7 percent). In other words, the leisure time of the country's population is about 20 percent of the entire available time.

If no more than 1 hour daily during the week and 3 hours daily during days off are used on education, this would amount to 573 hours annually. If we read no more than 10 pages per hour, we could read about 6,000 pages per year. Actually, many people make use of their leisure time either unproductively or underproductively, without any planning. Scientific and technical progress and the scale of the socioeconomic problems currently being solved by our society give priority to the requirement of achieving the highest possible culture, understood in the broadest possible meaning of the term, which every individual and each collective must have.

Our social scientists must make a thorough study of a relatively new phenomenon in the capitalist world: the implementation of a variety of sociotechnological programs, plans and recommendations and the arsenal of means of social technology it has developed, aimed at offering an alternative to social revolution under the conditions of scientific and technical progress. Professor G. Ikonnikova, CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, expressed a viewpoint according to which social technology could and should be put to good service under socialism. However, the speaker said, some Marxist theoreticians are prejudiced against the very term "social technology;" furthermore, nothing is being done either in the theoretical or the practical areas in solving this problem.

However, social technology could more efficiently combine theoretical with practical social science. So far, although having proper concepts and objectives and properly realizing the problems which we must solve, frequently we have either been unable to solve them or have even obtained undesirable results. Sociotechnological knowledge must integrate the achievements of many scientific disciplines which study different aspects of the life and activities of society, the collective and the individual.

Let us consider, for example, the problem of developing a socialist-type personality. This is not exclusively a pedagogical problem. It is a problem

of development of all realms of our social life the solution of which must embody the strictest possible principles of humanism.

The purpose of social technology is to exclude a one-dimensional approach to the shaping of public opinion. We proceed from the fact that it is precisely the school which must train people with an active social stance, conscientious working people. In that case, how to explain the fact that a number of informal youth associations have appeared in our country, such as "hippies," "metallists," "breakers," "wavers," and so on? The young people belonging to these groups are Soviet school alumni! However, they have their own vision of values—spiritual and material—which occasionally assumes an antisocial nature in their actions. Obviously, so far in our work with young people and children we have taken poorly into consideration the standardization of social knowledge (by age group, in particular) and the impact of all relations in the micro- and macroenvironment on shaping the personality. Organizing the upbringing on the basis of sociotechnological knowledge would be unquestionably more successful than the use of the "trial and error" method.

The development of a social technology in shaping any kind of social phenomenon must be related to modeling, extensive use of computers and programming. In the organization of human activities sociotechnological knowledge should provide us with a vision of their basic stages and operations and the ways, means and methods of achieving our objectives.

Socialism's entry into the age of dynamic development, the bold removal of obsolete concepts, methods, and stereotypes, and the all-round development of socialist democracy, openness and assertion of social justice are a complex and quite contradictory process. We see, M. Dobroselskiy said, that many of our public figures who consider themselves communist oppose the vitally necessary, the inevitable changes. We must not underestimate this opposition and assume that it can be surmounted through rational arguments and by proving the usefulness of the changes. We are amazed when we think of the great deal of energy, inventiveness and cunning that is invested by people in order to preserve their customary structures and defend decrees the implementation of which proved harmful to society, and all of this because at one point they had accepted them either as accurate or else as convenient to themselves.

Active, unrestrained, grubbing and envious bureaucratic stupidity grew and spread, pigeonholing the world and squeezing it within documents, stipulations and orders, neglecting man with his vital needs.

Blabberings about the need for change and for taking into consideration the new and steadily changing conditions, frequently replace the practical application of such changes. For the sake of appearance, frequently symbolic reorganizations take place, names and labels are changed or, in short, spoiled milk is poured into clean bottles. There is talk of changing work style and methods but all that changes is the manner of speech. Unfortunately, this is an aspect of the problem of the human factor today.

We must firmly master the Marxist truth that constant change and development is the only permanent condition of our existence and that it is our duty energetically to follow the path earmarked at the 27th CPSU Congress and the

10th PZPR Congress, without anticipating but also in no case allowing stagnation and sluggishness in the implementation of ripe changes and in solving new problems.

Social Functions and Interpretation of Science

Mankind, Marx wrote, "sets itself only the type of problems which it can solve, for a close look always shows that the problem itself arises when the material conditions for solving it are already extant or, at least, are in the process of being established" (op cit., vol 13, p 7). The scale of the problems currently solved by society is largely predetermined by the achievements of science. It is important, in this connection, to understand the type of functions which science performs in the contemporary world.

In his discussion of this problem, B. Yudin, doctor of philosophical sciences and deputy editor in chief of the journal VOPROSY ISTORII YESTESTIVOZNANIYA I TEKHNIKI, spoke, first, about the cultural and conceptual functions of science. In the course of historical development, they became apparent earlier than others without, however, losing their significance to this day. Furthermore, their role is steadily increasing, for without resorting to science today no productive discussion of the future of man and civilization is possible. Naturally, an exclusive orientation toward science in shaping the outlook would be insufficient; to an increasing extent we realize the need for unity between science and the other forms of culture. However, the understanding of this unity and the ways of achieving it remain, for the time being, an area of lively debates and we are still far from having shed clarity on this problem.

Increasingly, contemporary science is functioning as a direct production force. This determines the second group of its social functions. Acknowledging exclusively the cultural and conceptual role of science sometimes leads to a narrow understanding of the responsibility of scientists: it is interpreted only as a responsibility for the accuracy of research and reliability of results. However, scientific and technical progress equipped man with most powerful technology which can be used for both humane and antihumane purposes. The study of alternate trends in the development of civilization has become a topic of scientific research. For that reason said groups of functions become closer to and interwoven with each other and gradually science becomes an increasingly efficient social force.

It is this that determines the third group of functions: science is being increasingly used in solving a variety of problems which arise in the course of social development, such as the global problems of our time. If we take the ecological problem, for example, we would see that the appearance of a danger and its identification and realization, and the development of means to struggle against it are most closely related to science.

Science, however, particularly if we limit it to natural and technical subjects, is no panacea which would cure us from all ills or a universal means of solving most difficult problems. Although studies made by scientists, including social scientists, are important in the formulation of any economic, sociotechnical and other policy, decision making remains the function of

society. That is why, V. Gorokhov, department editor at the journal VOPROSY FILOSOFII and doctor of philosophical sciences, said, the alternatives of different types of projects, plans and programs have been studied by the whole nation and have not been the result of executive conferences or arbitrary decisions, even though officially supported by the authority of science. Such discussions must be conducted with the active participation of the representatives of various trends and schools and not only by supporters but also opponents of one or another major project and specialists not only in the natural and technical but also the social sciences. Today the decisions which are being made are so serious that their implementation will affect the living environment of the present and future generations. No references to governmental, economic or technical expediency or superior scientific interests can justify any moral and material harm which could be caused to mankind.

"Man is the true measure of all things!" This is the slogan of true humanism. Today it assumes a profound meaning and particular significance. This theme (the theme of technological democracy, as it is sometimes known) was heard in many of the roundtable speeches. Z. Ciackowski, professor at M. Sklodowska-Curie University (Lublin) emphasized that scientific consultations and expert evaluations suggested by the government should be made public. Scientist must not be allowed to "whisper" their advice to the authorities. Such advice must be given as publicly as possible for two reasons. First, the state authorities must take into consideration not only the views of scientists they consider acceptable and convenient but also those which disturb existing practices. Consequently, science requires certain means of pressure, such as public support. Second, scientists may be wrong; generally speaking, the scientific community is rarely unanimous in practical matters. That is why the openness of an expert evaluation and various consultations could ensure both the full responsibility of experts as well as the participation of the widest possible range of specialists. It is thus, the speaker said, that the public passing scientific verdicts includes a mechanism for their correction and self-correction.

The problem of a comprehensive and open strict expert evaluation under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution is drawing the increasing attention of scientists and the broad public. Its solution would largely eliminate the threat of technocratic thinking and ensure the integration of knowledge on the basis of the interaction among the natural, social and technical sciences. According to S. Wronski, B. Yudin and many others, we need at this point an international "club for expert evaluations," the activities of which would embody the new way of thinking and would shape the unified science of the future, as anticipated by Marx himself.

The shaping of such integrated science and the interaction among scientific disciplines are among the characteristic features of our time. These processes are being actively developed in various areas, said V. Kuptsov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, doctor of philosophical sciences. On the one hand, mathematics is literally permeating the fabric even of sciences which, only 15 to 20 years ago, were considered strictly descriptive. This is greatly assisted by the computerization of research and the methods of mathematical modeling, which

have penetrated even history, linguistics and art studies, not to mention biology or the earth sciences. On the other hand, the results obtained in some areas of science are being used increasingly in other. This applies, for example, to the physics of elementary particles, cosmology and the sciences dealing with the micro- and macroworld. Another aspect of integration is the search for universal laws governing the behavior of complex systems, from mechanistic to biological and social (synergetics).

The role of biology has sharply increased in the modern natural sciences. In the recent past some of its features, which place biology in the border area separating the natural sciences from the humanities, were ignored. This was pointed out by A. Urbanek, vice president of the Polish Academy of Sciences. The point is that man is one of the most important objects of biology. Consequently, biology deals with an individual who, as a rule, has unique features. Furthermore, it studies the profound link between man and the biosphere and actively participates in the development of the new philosophy of balance between society and nature. Increasingly, the problem of man is eliminating the separation between the natural and social sciences. It is much more profitable to emphasize their complementary nature than to pit one against the other, as was the case not so long ago. The speaker noted that a historically originated underestimating in public awareness of the natural and the technical sciences as mandatory and leading components of Polish culture. Priority here is in the humanities. The elimination of this one-sidedness is considered by the Polish scientists a most important task in the areas of culture and education and a major national objective.

However successfully the integration among sciences may develop, however, we cannot ignore the tremendous complexity of this process. It is paralleled by another process--the differentiation among and increasingly narrow specialization of scientific workers. The ideal image of the contemporary scientist is a person with high skills in a narrow area but with the broadest possible outlook. Unfortunately, the higher education system is unable to solve this problem today. The viewpoint expressed by Yu. Lipets and V. Kuptsov was that raising a broadly educated youth, which can successfully promote scientific and technical progress, is the task of the universities. It is precisely the universities, providing that they are properly organized, that can become a community of scientists from different fields, who can train the next generation to respond increasingly to the ideals of integrated science. It is important to this effect also to combine some of the functions of the universities with those of the academies of sciences and to ensure the reliable feedback between the scientific community and the youth which aspires toward scientific activities. The continuity of generations and the role and place of young people in science in general must become one of the main problems in the contemporary life of socialist society, which is developing its own economy and social programs on the basis of scientific and technical progress.

Naturally, the responsibility of the scientists for the fate of civilization today is conceived, above all, from the viewpoint of the struggle for peace and against the nuclear threat. As I. Maletskiy noted, the reason is that it is precisely the members of the scientific community who are most actively participating in the development of new technologies and new equipment,

including military hardware. They frequently act as advisors to governments and are able, better than anyone else, to assess comprehensively and far-sightedly various state projects and programs. The high prestige of scientists in society intensifies their role in molding public opinion on problems of war and peace.

However, we must take a broader look at the responsibility of scientists to society. The cultural and conceptual role of science has been noted. However, do we have at our disposal good literature which can shape a scientific outlook in the broadest possible public circles? Yu. Lipets pointed out that textbooks on the foundations of Marxism have become hopelessly obsolete: they have fallen behind contemporary science and life itself and can interest no one with their form or their content. Engels, however, said that each discovery in the natural sciences changes the form of materialism. How many profound and revolutionary discoveries seem to have been ignored by the Marxists and by the authors of such very imperfect books! Academician N. Moiseyev pointed out that some social scientists are creating the fatal impression that Marxism is reduced to excerpts from the collected works of Marx. Yet the most interesting task of the true Marxist is to learn how these geniuses of mankind—Marx, Engels and Lenin—would have solved today's problem. Marxism is a method for the universal study of most complex conflicts in contemporary life!

There is a prevalent opinion according to which returning to the sources would ensure the creative functioning of Marxism, Z. Ciaczkowski said. This is correct. However, we must remember that a return to sources does not mean only a return to the classical Marxist texts; it means, above all, a return to reality, for the basic source of Marxist thinking is, precisely, the study of the real world. It is only thus that we can awaken a new public interest in Marxism and expose the growing generation to it.

It is the duty of the scientists, the social scientists above all, to prove in fact that Marxism-Leninism has not become obsolete but that the obsolescence has affected some concepts of Marxism-Leninism, concepts shared by some people who consider themselves Marxists. The theory of social development, embodied in the works of Marx and Engels and creatively developed by V.I. Lenin and by the entire experience of the global communist movement, is being practically embodied today in the achievements of socialism. This theory is the base of the processes which are developing today in Soviet society: restructuring, acceleration of the country's sociodemocratic development, democratization of all aspects of life, development of openness and criticism and self-criticism, and establishing a new style of thinking, consistent with the requirements of the time and the realities of our age.

Marxism is not a dogma but a manual for action. This Leninist formula can be confidently used to sum up the results of the roundtable discussions sponsored in Poland by the fraternal journals *KOMMUNIST* and *NOWE DROGI*.

The Zaboruwa debates lasted 2 days. They were widely covered by the Polish mass information media. The central press described the proceedings at the conference and the participants spoke on television. However, in Warsaw as well, after the conclusion of the conference, a lively and sharp exchange of

views continued to take place and new ideas and suggestions came up. J. Czierek, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member and secretary, highly rated its significance in terms of the party's ideological and theoretical work, and in strengthening friendship and cooperation between the PZPR and the CPSU and between Polish and Soviet scientists.

The members of the Soviet delegation shared their impressions on the conference and on the problems which were discussed at the roundtable meeting with lecturers at the Warsaw Vovedstvo PZPR Committee, workers and engineers at the Mera-Pnefal Industrial Automation Enterprise, members of the PZPR Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, the Polish Academy of Sciences, the aktiv of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Club and the editors of NOWE DROGI. Wherever discussions were held with the Polish comrades, we invariably felt their tremendous interest in the life of our party and state. We felt warm support for the CPSU course, as formulated at the 27th Party Congress and January 1987 Central Committee Plenum. We left the People's Republic of Poland with the firm belief that the potential for cooperation between our parties and peoples is tremendous, that our fraternity will become stronger and our common objectives will be attained.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

GENETICS, SOCIETY, PERSONALITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 90-97

[Article by D. Belyayev]

[Text] The name of the outstanding Soviet geneticist, Academician D.K. Belyayev (1917-1985) is widely known in our country and abroad. He was not only a talented researcher but also an educator, scientific organizer, public figure, a person of great courage and impeccable civic stance. Following is a report submitted by D.K. Belyayev at the 15th International Genetics Congress (New Delhi, India) in December 1983. This report was not published previously in Russian. In a vivid and concise form it presents the essence of the author's concept which, because of its rather polemical nature, drew and continues to draw the attention of scientists working on the set of problems of man related, in particular, to the correlation between his social and biological aspect. As many scientists believe, this concept, which rejects the view that man is exclusively a "social cluster," contains a tremendous creative potential. In the opinion of the editors, the publication of D.K. Belyayev's paper, in addition to previously published materials by other authors, will enable KOMMUNIST readers to gain a fuller idea on the nature of the discussion which are taking place on this set of problems.

Unquestionably, as a living, feeling and thinking being, man embodies the highest achievement of the evolution of life in our planet. Having developed to a tremendous extent the power of his mind and character, and his ability to formulate most expedient programs for individual behavior and labor, speech and the structure of social forms of life, in the full meaning of the term, man became a social being. This means that the social environment is the main force which shapes man's social position and aspirations.

Ever since a society appeared, it is processes of its historical development rather than biological evolution that have been the motive force of mankind. The social differentiation in human society and its social structure are determined by the place held by man in public production and the attitude of the people toward means of production and the nature of production relations as a whole. It is senseless to seek any kind of analogy between social relations among people in terms of behavioral characteristics and the structure of animal societies. Even in higher mammals--monkeys--not to

mention other animals, laws essentially different from those applicable to human society have prevailed..

However, having become a social being, man did not abandon his biological individuality in all of its manifestations. The social conditions of life do not eliminate genetic differences among people, which appear as a result of the universality of the laws governing the chromosome theory of heredity. The tremendous amount of factual data acquired so far proves that there are no nervous-mental or behavioral features determining man's individual and personal qualities which remain outside interpersonality genetic variations.

Human mental characteristics, such as verbal understanding, spatial perception, speech and musical and mathematical capabilities, temperament and level of emotionality depend, to one extent or another, on the genetic factor. This also applies to human features such as strength, sensitivity and lability of his nervous system, and psychodynamic and neurodynamic parameters determined through a variety of methods. It is noteworthy that certain parameters of the human encephalogram, the alpha rhythm in particular, which characterizes a certain basic condition of the functional activity of the associative area of the brain, remain under genetic control. The alpha rhythm, which develops toward the age of 12 to 14 and, sometimes, even somewhat earlier, remains throughout man's lifetime as his individual characteristic. However, the interpersonality variations within it are exceptionally great. In frequent cases the share of the genetic variability of such features can be quite considerable and its contribution to the general genetic information quite high. Thus, for example, 30 to 80 percent of the overall phenotypical variability of such parameters are accounted for by the share of the genetic component in the variability of psychodynamic and neurodynamic components which characterize the strength and lability of the nervous system in some populations in the Caucasus.

Most of the data which indicate the existence of the genetic component of variability were obtained on the basis of the study of monozygotic and bioval twins; however, many of the studies also made use of the methods of family and population-genetic analysis. The fact that both methods yield qualitatively identical results confirms the reality of genetic variability and genetic determination of human mental features and characteristics.

In this connection, let us emphasize that the component of genetic variability in mental features applies only to interpersonality variabilities. It is an interpersonality feature within the limits of any national, racial or social group. However, it has not been found to be a reliable parameter of interracial and international variability or intergroup variability among social strata. Some studies which prove interracial differences in the parameters of human mental features--this applies, in particular to the so-called IQ of whites and blacks--were already in their time subjected to a thorough and competent critical study (the IQ is determined with the help of special tests and reflects the ability to solve a given problem at a given time, i.e., it reflects only a few aspects of the mind but not the intellect as the creative and moral potential of man). The groundlessness of concepts concerning the existence of interracial genetic differences among people in terms of the ability to learn, understand and develop the mind was proved.

In recognizing the existence of the genetic potential in the phenotype variety of personality qualities in human behavior, we must nevertheless emphasize two universally known essential facts.

First, the exceptional variety of all personality features of man, and motivations for his behavior and level of intellect. Although physiology has acquired a tremendous volume of data which show the dynamics of the functional activities of the human brain and individual structures, the totality of such data have still not clarified the material morphofunctional base which is specifically responsible for shaping the individual. That is why we still accept a view about the brain, according to which all of its parts participate, to one extent or another, in shaping all types of feelings or actions in a normally healthy person. The functional asymmetry of the hemispheres of the brain, based on their participation in abstract thinking or specific-associative perception, discovered recently, were a major landmark in the study of the material foundations of thinking. This, however, does not eliminate the basic problems pertaining to the very nature of the person and the intellect. To a certain extent, abstract-logical and sensory elements are present in any human behavioral act which, naturally, goes beyond simple reflex. In particular, this applies to the peak of creative accomplishments which characterize the intellect. Who could determine whose intellect is greater, that of Einstein or Dostoyevskiy, Rabinovitch Tagor or Beethoven? What are the features of the morphofunctional organization of the brain of such people whose thoughts shake up our consciousness? There is nothing we can say on this question except that without the stress of mental efforts, without such tremendous stress no fruitful thinking, whatever direction it may take, would be possible.

Second is the consistency between the most complex morphofunctional organization of the brain and the equally complex system of man's genetic determination. At the present time we have already identified some 3,000 mutant human genes, hundreds of which participate in the development of some aspects of the personality. However, we do not know of a single gene whose main effect is responsible for a specific feature in the determination of individual characteristics and individualities in a normal healthy person. Furthermore, many genes which cause mental defects are characterized by an extremely varied frequency of manifestations in populations and an expressiveness to which a great number of pathological conditions, difficult to diagnose or left entirely without a diagnosis, as well as borderline cases, are related.

Therefore, we note a tremendous polymorphism in the elements of the hereditary system, which determines individual and personality human features. This creates the true uniqueness of the genotype of the individual, regardless of national, racial or social affiliation.

However, all human individual and personality features, attitude toward those around him and behavior in society are always determined by the interaction between the genetic system and the external conditions under which the system takes shape and develops.

Today the the role which interaction between "genotype and environment" plays in the development of any feature of the organism is entirely clear and considered natural. In terms of man, it has a certain specific feature. In shaping man's individuality, as early as during the embryonic stage of development, i.e., through a system of metabolic exchanges with the mother and, subsequently, after birth, the great volume of sensory information, which increases with age, is of essential importance. In this sense the social environment in the entire huge variety of its qualitative manifestations and forces of influence, plays a special and absolutely unique role. Let us note that in the study of twins in terms of the genetic component of variability, naturally, social influences on the development of the brain in its embryonic phase are taken greatly into consideration. This may be one of the reasons for the deliberate boosting of the importance of this component in assessing IQ differences. The tremendous reactive power of the genetic system which controls the development of individual human qualities, the inordinate plasticity and adaptability of all nervous processes to factors of social surroundings, and to all the concepts, institutions and traditions of family and society deprive the genetic program of fatal significance in the development of the mind and individual characteristics of the person. However, the social environment, which determines social consciousness to a decisive extent, neither replaces nor could replace interpersonality genetic changes and the genetic uniqueness of the individual. The social group cannot play the role of absolute despot in shaping the human personality, for its imperatives, under whose influence man remains regardless of his own wishes, clash with the imperatives of the genes which man equally does not choose. Consequently, the Aristotelian idea that the child is a "clean slate" is not confirmed. This objective contradiction of life, apparently inherent in anything that is animate, is solved in the case of man through the formation of an entirely unique structure. the brain, as the biosocial organ of the individual.

The brain, the functional activities of which are manifested through thinking and behavior, is a biosocial organ which determines man's biosocial nature. In terms of his higher manifestations--intellect, emotionality and social aspirations--every individual is an indivisible entity of genetic with social factors. This excludes any kind of dualism in assessing the nature of man and his personality. However, the manifestations of this unity are specific. This determines the various basic concepts of man and the dynamics of his behavior at any given moment, as he reacts to specific vital and, above all, social situations.

The uniqueness of the biosocial organization of man, which is realized in a unique and entirely individual nature of activities of the brain and thinking, leads to one of the paradoxes in human life: as the product of society and the culture and social environment it creates, and in structuring the strategy of his behavior in accordance with the social situation, man always reacts individually to the specific assessments of real life and the self-assessments of his own "I." Such features of self-control and self-regulation of behavior and emotionality, of which man is unaware, are embryonically inherent, one assumes, in the higher representatives of the animal world. However, it is only in man that this feature acquires an absolutely new, a qualitatively different significance.

If everything animate develops within the system of two components--heredity and environment--through their interaction, in the case of man, as an individual, we must add a third element, i.e., himself, his own "ego" with its own world of the spirit, feelings, thoughts, passions, behavior and personal decisions.

The biosocial uniqueness of the individual is one of the manifestations of the tremendous polymorphism within the range of the biological species *Homo sapiens*. The origins of this polymorphism, as that of the biosocial nature of man itself, should be sought in man's evolution which contains a number of features and mysteries.

Paleontological records have left no proof which could be used as a basis for an accurate duplication of the evolution of *Homo sapiens*. That is why, inevitably, we are forced here to use the deductive method which, in my view, is neither absolute nor entirely groundless.

The most characteristic features in the evolution of man's hominid predecessors and man himself, are naturally related to the development of his brain. There is hardly any doubt that the transition from the australopithecine to *Pithecanthropus erectus* gave man tremendous adaptive advantages and opened new ways of evolution as a result of at least two interrelated events.

First, the fact that the frontal extremities were released, subsequently developing into hands, and the perfection of the erectile position. This increased the functional load on the brain, which had to learn how to control the development and functions of the body under the conditions of man's new orientation in space. It is entirely understandable that, in turn, this determined a new vector for the characteristics of the brain responsible for the development of the corresponding sensory motor areas.

Second, the change in the position of the head drastically increased the volume of information absorbed by the brain from the outside and thus offered new opportunities in assessing vital situations, anticipating them and formulating expedient behavioral programs. This fact enhanced to the utmost the ability to select, based on the brain's information-prognostic capabilities.

The entire evolution of the hominid predecessors of man is noted by an ever-growing pace and increased volume and complexity of the brain's morphofunctional organization. However, the body develops as an entity and in the evolution of the pre-man, this principle is manifested with exceptional clarity. Within a shortest possible historical time on the scale of evolutionary change, a time related to changes in the brain, the ability of man to walk erect developed and improved, the hands were perfected and articulate speech appeared as the most important means of social communication. Such a process of most complex morphophysiological restructuring of the entire body could take place only on the basis of a tremendous enhancement of the amplitude and pace of hereditary change. According to molecular studies, this change affected less the structural than the regulatory elements of the genome; it proved to be the necessary as well

as the suitable basis for advanced evolution from hominid human predecessors to man himself. This change was so great and the evolutionary process so specific that E. Mayer was justified in saying that each organ and the entire system of organs experienced their own individual evolution.

L. Leakey, whose works in paleoanthropology are universally known, believes that the difference between Neanderthal and contemporary man is morphologically so great as to be unable to create offspring. This circumstance, which is difficult to explain on the basis of independent mutation events, is one of the mysteries of anthropogenesis. However, this is amazingly similar to what was noted in the domestication of animals. Within the shortest possible historical time, no more than 8,000 to 10,000 years, domestication created changes comparable to differences among species.

Studies of domestication, which have been carried out in my laboratory for more than 25 years, with silver-black foxes bred in captivity, has clearly confirmed the fact that the key mechanism of the entire variety of domestication changes is a selection in the nature of the animals' defensive behavior. The essence of the matter is that in the area of selection in domesticating behavior, i.e., the ability of animals to coexist with man, such as man's friend, the dog, some species have an increased degree of resistance to agents new to the species and, therefore, stress-creating, the most important among which is man himself. Drastic changes in the ecological situation and the appearance in the habitat of new psychoemotional irritants, new to the species and as yet unmastered, trigger an acute stress which, let us emphasize this, is always accompanied by drastic changes in the hormonal status of the organism, i.e., changes in the concentration and correlation among different hormones. It is only species which can withstand the pressure of this new stress agent and changed hormonal condition that can be domesticated. The others are eliminated as a result either of inadequate behavior (aggressiveness) or a blockage of the procreative function.

Hormones play a special role in animal metabolism. On the one hand, as we now know, they are controlled by the genetic system which acts either directly on their synthesis or, which is even more important, indirectly, through the regulatory function of the central nervous system. On the other, these are specific inductors of gene functional activities and the most important regulators of the processes of cascade biosynthesis, carried out through a variety of molecular mechanisms which the limitations of an article prevents us from discussing. Therefore, hormones, although perhaps not they alone, are the material binding link between the central nervous system (the brain) and the genetic system of the organism.

The destabilization of previous standards governing the development of the organism and a drastic enhancement of heredity changes are the results of the selection based on resistance to stress and a type of payment for it. Obviously, selection implements its destabilizing function whenever it

includes the main links which regulate ontogenesis and the gene systems which determine them.

At the present time laboratory models have experimentally proved the influence of psychoemotional stress on genetic processes. For example, the works of our laboratory proved the existence of a drastic change in the variability of indicators governing the reproduction of mice under the influence of a psychoemotional immobilizing stress; the rank of animals of different genotypes in terms of reproduction functions changes. Consequently, the stress reveals intrapopulation genetic variability and the selective value of animals belonging to different genotypes, under normal and stress conditions, turns out different.

Psychoemotional stress substantially influences the redistribution of the genetic material of the parents in their offspring and the mutation of genes which result in the death of animals.

The influence of hormones of the corticosteroid complex on the activeness of some genes in mice was experimentally confirmed. Genetic effects of hormones are manifested, one may assume, in the inherited activity or inactivity of genes.

Today the sum of such data allows us to say that a material system for straight and inverse connection exists between the brain and genes. A key role in this connection is played by stress, which plays the role of an internal mechanism in regulating inherited variability and the evolutionary process.

It is precisely for this reason that the destabilizing effect of selection is manifested in the tremendous scope of variability, based on stress and related hormonal influences on the genetic system of the organism and genetic processes in populations. In supplying material for other results of selection—motor and stabilizing—destabilizing selection accelerates the evolutionary process to a tremendous extent.

The main feature in the evolution of man—the ever-growing complexity of the brain structure and nerve processes and intensified intra-brain interactions—automatically contributed to increased self-stress. The broadened type and volume of perceived information, the development of labor activities and the formation of speech placed our ancestors under the strongest possible pressure of outside stress. During those evolutionary stages selection directly led the straight-walking hominid on the path of resistance to increased psychoemotional stresses.

The importance of psychoemotional processes and stress as internal evolutionary factors increased particularly and continued to increase during the phase of man's social life. Under these circumstances, selection raised entirely new requirements concerning the behavior of the individual: ability to accept the standards and traditions of society and of his specific social environment, i.e., self-control in behavior and self-assessment of his own position in society. It is precisely under these circumstances that the biosocial nature of man and the biosocial function of his brain became

exceptionally strong. Although it remained an object of evolution, behavior also became one of its factors.

The social environment created an essentially new ecological environment for man. It can be hardly doubted that words, with their comprehensive mental stress, created for man incomparably greater stress than a club hitting a Neanderthal. The real human brain and consciousness, which enabled man to withstand tremendous stress loads, developed under these conditions of biosocial evolution. However, this led to a tremendous increase in man's polymorphism, one of the manifestations of which is the paradox of the nervous-mental evolution, as described by S.N. Davidenkov, the outstanding Soviet neuropathologist. This means that pathological types of nervous systems became exceptionally widespread in mankind, systems which "collapse" in the face of minor difficulties. Davidenkov explained this fact with the end of natural selection in human society.

The idea of natural selection and evolution of contemporary man coming to a virtual end under the influence of exceptionally increased culture is shared, apparently, by many biologists. However, whereas according to Mayer, evolution means "changes in the variety and adaptability of populations of organisms," we should agree with F. Dobrzansky, who has repeatedly claimed that the evolution of contemporary man is continuing. He justifiably considered as reason for this process the new environment created by the technological and cultural achievements of mankind. This is an unquestionable fact, perhaps, for the only reason that today a large number of various chemical mutagens have appeared in the external environment. No less important, however, is the fact that in modern society man is experiencing increasing psychoemotional stress caused by the growing complexity of social and, consequently, private life. The demands of the social environment, the contradictions between society and the individual and interpersonality conflicts have reached today a level of dramatic gravity. The destabilizing function of selection under these circumstances could even increase and it is precisely this function that creates, among others, the paradox of the nervous-mental evolution mentioned by Davidenkov.

It is difficult to imagine that the evolution of man has come to an end today. We must take into consideration the fact that the embryonal mortality in man is no lesser than 40-50 percent and that, most likely, it is selective. The increased average life span—a phenomenon specifically related to enhancing the activities of neurohormonal regulators—has, unquestionably, its own genetic component and biosocial and evolutionary consequences, the assessment of which cannot be as yet determined with adequate certainty.

Our life sets genetics tasks of tremendous universal significance. Some of the most important among them are increasing the food potential of the world, particularly in the developing countries. Although genetics has already accomplished a great deal in the struggle against hunger, the latter remains one of the reasons for suffering and shame in our world. The elimination of this calamity is less a function of science than it is of the organization of society. If mankind can save itself from nuclear self-destruction, this problem will unquestionably be solved. It is unquestionable that material living conditions—work, food, clothing and housing—are the foundations of

mankind's social progress. However, it is indeed true that a scant meal prepared with love is better than a fat piece of ham larded with hatred and malice.

At that point, however, our science must study the biosocial nature of man himself, the laws governing its formation, the specific forms of its manifestation and the structure of the phenotype of behavior of the normal man and his genetic determination.

Stress is a necessary condition and attribute of life itself and the total elimination of stress sectors is as unrealistic as it is harmful. In itself, it is no lesser than the collisions of life.

Although the plasticity and resistance of our brain to stress loads are high they are not unlimited. That is why today the question of admissible, i.e., safe levels of psychoemotional loads and stress not only affecting the brain and the physiology of the individual but genetic processes as well have become so crucial. The entire line of "brain-gene" communication has not been studied. Nonetheless, it exists as a reality and it is precisely genetics that should answer the question of whether the psychoemotional stress which is increasing in our life will cause irreparable damage to the genetic stock of mankind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

THE COURSE OF DESTINY: AN ESSAY ON ACADEMICIAN N. P. BEKHTEREVA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 98-101

[Article by Yevgeniya Nikolayevna Manucharova, IZVESTIYA special correspondent]

[Text] Being a journalist and an old acquaintance, and because of my great interest in the puzzle presented by this person, whenever we meet I ask her questions. I would like to know her opinions either as brain researcher or a woman with an ideal taste, a physician, an art expert and a traveler (she has lectured in many scientific capitals in the world), or else as one of the greatest organizers of health care and director of the academic Scientific Research Institute of Experimental Medicine.

N.P. Bekhtereva has extensive business and friendly contacts. How does she select them?

"Natalya Petrovna, what is the feature that you value in people the most?"

"Dependability. If someone says yes it must mean yes. If you say something, do it. When I was young I was attracted mostly by talent, by intellectual clarity. I still am. However, if I am not confident that I am dealing with a person on whom I can rely, this clarity darkens. I believe that in such a person it is quite likely that talent will turn out barren."

"Who are more dependable: men or women? Whom would you choose?"

"That is not the way I rate people in my work. I have never taken up a project (or refused it) based on the sex of the person. It is more difficult for women to work in science. If a woman is smart, people would say 'smart woman.' Not researcher, not worker but precisely 'woman.' If she has made an error, it will be ascribed to 'the female mind,' whereas if a man makes an error it will always be ascribed to him personally, to Peter or Ivan. This is a psychological barrier which is still with us, although the most progressive laws have long been on the books. That is why when a woman reaches a high level in her work as organizer or researcher, it is obvious that no fault would be found in her industriousness and talent. Is this not so?..."

Bekhtereva loves to ask questions. She does this in a professional manner. She wants to know the structure of nature. Her studies have now reached a stage at which she could ask the human brain: "Tell me how you think?" And she would get an answer....

I remember the origins of her monograph "The Healthy and Sick Human Brain." I met with her when this manuscript on the complex system which allows people to think was almost ready for publication. In answer to my question, she answered:

"To think means to make decisions, and to make decisions means to think. There is always a choice to be made. The question I face now is the choice of an epigraph to the book. Actually, this has already been done."

She waved firmly her small hand: "In order to be successful one must set a target somewhat higher than the one which could be attained today. Max Plank said this."

Indeed, this sentence ideally reflects the path of her career in science and life.

Natalya Petrovna is third-generation scientist. The famous Psychoneurological Institute in Leningrad is named after her grandfather, Academician Vladimir Mikhaylovich Bekhterev, and so is the street on which the institute is located. Bekhterev died a sudden death in Moscow. The urn with his dust was brought to Leningrad.

At that time his granddaughter was only 3. However, she has remembered this event throughout her life.

Today there is a V.M. Bekhterev museum where documents related to his life are carefully preserved. To this day legends make the rounds of the clinic about the power of his hypnotic suggestions, and the unquestionable accuracy of his preliminary diagnoses. He was a genius in the field of brain studies and wrote more than 500 scientific works. The main among them were foundations of anatomy, physiology and psychology. At that time they were a breakthrough leading to the unknown. "To know man! This is a lofty calling," Bekhterev said. That is precisely what he considered to be his task.

Here is an interesting question: If a miracle were to happen, and if Bekhtereva, now an adult and a reputable researcher, were to meet with her grandfather, that great person, what would she ask him?

"Naturally, something which cannot be found in any book, something about the art of diagnosis and the amazing feeling about the brain, a sense of illness. A physician either has it or does not. The art of diagnosis is a talent multiplied by experience. However, talent is always greater than work in any profession."

"What could he possibly ask you, Natalya Petrovna?"

"Well: 'How do words look like in the brain?' This should interest him more than anything else. We have been able to see the objective base of subjectivity. We now see (in the material processes of the brain) the way words and phrases are presented and the way the brain handles summations and decision-making...."

To Vladimir Mikhaylovich Bekhterev, the great expert of the human soul, the personality begins where a "personal choice" must be made or, in other words, with decision-making. The choice made by his son was technology, an area in which Petr Vladimirovich earned a reputation as a designer and inventor in the defense of the country. He was arrested on the basis of a false denunciation in 1937.

Thirteen-year old Natasha was sent to a children's home with her sister and brother. She was her father's favorite and wanted to be like him. She did not accept his guilt, knowing that he would be acquitted.

He was acquitted posthumously.

Life had just begun to be somehow organized when there was a nationwide calamity: The Great Patriotic War, and the difficult blockade of Leningrad. She became a medical orderly and then a nurse. She was bright and knowledgeable and she could cheer up the wounded (like all true leaders she knows how to impart the right mood). She feared no job then, any does not fear any today, as a member of the academy.

Not all wounded survived. When she was on night duty she kept thinking about the unfair helplessness of medicine, about how little science knew about saving human lives and that it is the duty of the people to increase such knowledge.

As a mature person, she formulated a moral law for herself and her students: "Man must be held responsible for what he has failed to do." No, not only for the fact that he did not apply his knowledge but also for areas still unknown to mankind, areas not benefiting mankind. "Everyone is responsible not only for what he has done but also for what he has failed to do, for any delay in his accomplishments." This was what guided her in science, in gaining new knowledge about the brain and, in clinical work, in organizing treatments.

More than anything else clinical work proves the practicality of a good theory. It also describes the character of those who turn science into practical work, which is not easy. When Bekhtereva says that "One must stand up to the end!" it means that one must fight for the health of the patient as though the life of the fighter himself depends on it. "If the impossible has to be done one must attempt to do it calmly...."

Yet there was a time when she thought that "God" had decreed that she was not made to become a doctor and that this was not her decision but something dictated by fate. It was simply her duty. She became a physician because of her feeling of duty to the wounded and she completed her postgraduate studies quickly (she had always been a fast learner).

However, what interested and captivated her was not what was already known in medicine but what she had been thinking about during those hospital nights, when physicians were unable to cope with the severe damages done to the brain of the wounded. It was those dead-end streets, those puzzles that Bekhtereva chose as her science, this map with blank spots—human neurophysiology.

She started work at the Leningrad Institute of Neurosurgery. Surgery was based on the preliminary diagnosis and the physicians which would determine if the patient had a chance to live or if surgery was a waste. Bekhtereva participated in such consultations. She was helped by her intuition and thoroughness. However, frequently, again and again, she found herself in dead-end streets and blank spots and frequently realized that traditional research was useless in this case!

More knowledge of the brain had to be gained. This complex system had to be studied on a complex, a comprehensive basis. She realized that she had to leave the institute in order to be able to find essentially new solutions. The Institute of Experimental Medicine (IEM) in which she had done her postgraduate work, suggested that a department be set up to handle her specific subject. She called it the department of human neurophysiology. This was the first such scientific unit in the country.

At that time Bekhtereva's young department was very small, numbering 11 people, including the cleaning woman. Bekhtereva gave up cleaning women in favor of an engineer. Scientists made their own repairs. This did not seem to bother them, for the main thing was the opportunity to discuss their problems jointly.

When I first visited the IEM I was unable to determine whether I was in Bekhtereva's laboratory or her home. Sometimes no one knew in advance how many people would gather for a meal around a table, would it be only the family or another five people from the IEM. Sometimes she would keep in her apartment for several days one of her associates who was unable to figure out something or, conversely, an associate who had achieved some success and who was to be urged on.

And what about Bekhtereva, as the leader? She is always a "generator" (generator of ideas, which is something people like in a manager). The department felt two things about her: she was both an equal of and above the others. She was an equal because she was not an administrator but a researcher, a physician. She was above the others because it was precisely she who was able to help all the others in any confused interaction with the secrets of nature.

The department needed researchers who could think for themselves, physiologists, neurosurgeons, neuropathologists and psychologists, people working in a great variety of scientific fields, for this was to mark the birth of a new comprehensive method for the study of the brain, which should provide maximal information both about the brain and the rest of the body. At the same time, the patients were to be minimally bothered in terms of research and treatment. This was determined by her life stance, convictions and daily practice. Bekhtereva believes that in working with the patients the clinical

worker must concentrate precisely on the patient's problems. He cannot carry out the type of studies which would serve his needs and only then those of the patient. At the same time, the scientist must be aware of the entire area of the tasks of medicine and base his work on the interests of all mankind.

At that time Dmitriy Andreyevich Biryukov, member of the Academy of Medical Sciences, was IEM director. As he told me, he tried to warn Bekhtereva about the gap which separated what was being done from what was possible and the fact that it would take many years to breach the wall of medical mistrust and inertia.

Bekhtereva listened politely and calmly and the perceptive Biryukov could read on her face the resolve that "The problem must be solved and will be solved."

She achieved what she wanted. In her department of human neurophysiology a comprehensive method for the diagnosis and treatment of severe illnesses, which could not be achieved with the usual means was developed. This provided not only new opportunities in medical practices but also made it possible to observe the brain from within, as it worked (thoughts, emotions). This was an essentially new scientific level. Until then the human brain had been considered something like a "black box:" the work of its structures was judged by comparing "input," with "output" data. With the new method the working areas of the brain described their functions through their own bioflows, for the brain (like the entire body) is a chemical and electrical system.

Bekhtereva's repeated and lengthy observations enabled her to develop the theory of the "rigid" and "flexible" parts of the brain. The "rigid" areas are those which are mandatorily included in very specific operations (some of them participate in computations, others in writing and others again in speech functions). The "flexible" areas are "ministers without portfolio." They can always be reoriented and included in various projects if needed, by energizing and de-energizing them.

Bekhtereva and her associates discovered important fine brain mechanisms, such as the biological clocks of the brain. Bekhtereva proved that the brain can operate on different time systems. For example, famous computation experts can handle huge numbers virtually at computer speed. There are patients with extremely slowed-down speech and mental processes. The new comprehensive method developed by the IEM for stimulating the brain can help them. In some professions and in difficult situations the brain itself switches to a fast mode.

Academician Bekhtereva believes that all of us have such an ability. However, she is not in a hurry to recommend speed training. She cautions that the biological danger presented by speed training must be studied. Her essential view is maximally to spare the organism and to conquer nature without violating its laws.

She is especially interested in the mechanisms of brain reliability. One of them, discovered by Bekhtereva and her associates, is a system which reacts only if errors are made. Regardless of the meaning and significance of the

action, it sends signals to direct the attention of the brain to the error. This self-control mechanism permits us to make a minimal number of errors and has an insurance function.

An essentially new area which was not even imagined before her work is the neurophysiology of mental processes, the study of the material foundations of thinking. Her school of physiologists proved that the traditional idea that man "thinks with the cortex" (exclusively) is not entirely accurate. In order to enhance reliability, nature has duplicated the most important systems. Bekhtereva proved that there are parts of the subcortical area directly related to the higher functions of consciousness. She was able to find neurons related to speech, decision-making and image recognition.

The normal brain protects itself by balancing emotions and tries not to plunge entirely and at length into enthusiasm or despair. The sick brain works differently: it could be flooded by a wave of negative emotions. Should this last, the brain will forget how to experience joy. Its entire territory will be taken over only by negative emotions. Dealing with this situation would become difficult, as would be the case with any durable pathological condition. Even a healthy person would exclaim, despairingly, after a lasting trouble: "It is all the same to me whether to suffer or be happy, I became used to suffering a long time ago." Any thinking person could learn how to control his condition and not allow himself to become "used to suffering."

Academician Bekhtereva's comprehensive method makes it possible to determine the moment emotions are generated. That is why even before a severe depression develops in the patient, the physician could become aware of this dangerous situation and determine whether the brain has enough strength to deal with it alone or whether steps must be taken and organize a defense perimeter around the threatened center. The physician could stimulate the necessary areas and counter the ailing area with the function of happiness. This method is used by Bekhtereva's associates in fighting emotional disturbances in epileptics.

What gives science its nature is the fact that its final conclusions do not depend on the personality of the researcher. The researchers are objective. However, another thing that makes science what it is is that it always implies an encounter with the unknown. That is why the personality of the scientist frequently determines the trend and the speed of results in such encounters and, unquestionably, the pace of application.

The features of Natalya Petrovna's character have been largely responsible for the successful application of modern methods. Today the science of the human brain is inconceivable without the use of Bekhtereva's results. They are already applied in major clinics in our country and abroad.

At one point, however, a decision had to be made to this effect. And day after day the results (the healing of seemingly hopelessly sick patients) again and again proved the great need for new methods. Inordinate willpower, self-control and persistence were necessary....

Actually, any mention of time at this point would be inappropriate. To this day she has to fight hard for obtaining modern equipment. She particularly needs the vitally important positron-emission tomograph which has still not been developed in our country.

She is convinced that the study of a most complex organ such as the brain requires complex equipment. She does not consider it possible to abandon a necessary method simply because of the difficulty in organizing its application.

Bekhtereva herself never defines her life as a war against something or someone. She has dedicated her strength to the struggle "for" something. It is a struggle for every patient of hers, for the standards of medicine and physiology, for the standards of the institute she heads, for the young generation, for every one of her students.

Not so long ago, once again, as many years ago, I met with her in the yard of the IEM, where she stood with a group of young associates. And again, they tirelessly spoke about their main concerns. What was she to them? Their director? Yes, unquestionably. She was the firm head of the institute and the department but, more than anything else, the generator, the container of objectives, the person by whose side it is impossible to lower the standards of the work, to deal with trifles, to fail to climb to the top. Again and again she helps them recover from disappointments, doubts and fatigue. Again and again she solves puzzles created by the confused answers provided by nature. She singles out the main features of observations and is able to direct the course of research.

Every one of her students follows his own road to scientific independence. However, he earns Bekhtereva's complete approval only when he has reached the level at which what matters most is not the accumulation of ideas but the ability to share them generously. "You get and you give" is a dictum of Bekhtereva's school.

"How do you choose scientific areas and problems for the young, for the institute and for yourself?"

"In big science today the situation has changed. There are problems which face mankind. The fact that at any given stage they may seem insoluble as yet (for example, 15 years ago the search for a nerve code seemed to be a problem to be solved in the next century but it is already clear that such is not the case) does not matter. Science must mandatorily solve the problem set to mankind. The future will make the solution easier."

She has her own relationship with the future. She plans it on a long-range basis and in great detail. That is also how personnel work in the IEM is structured: she trains specific individuals for specific most crucial parts of the work. Systematically, without haste, she advances toward the target.

Typically, N.P. Bekhtereva always approaches the solution of scientific and clinical problems from the positions of the whole person. It is this that determines her overall views on the need to develop the comprehensive study of

man, a subject on which she tirelessly writes and speaks and for which she keeps struggling. It is also this that determines her interested attitude toward the idea of developing specific scientific-organizational structures such as the Institute of Man, an idea which is today extensively discussed by our scientists and men of culture and literature (although results so far have been obviously insufficient).

With her typical energy, Bekhtereva has joined the movement of scientists fighting for peace. The very idea of the loss of future for the earth is unbearable to her. She participates in debates, conferences, meetings with intellectuals from other countries and discussions with American scientists. She engages in them with calm intensiveness. Her thinking is sharp and her scientific proofs are convincing.

As a brain researcher she knows that nuclear preparations affect more than the future. People are becoming depressed already now and the depressing stress of the arms race is lowering the creative potential on earth. This is intolerable and she is not about to abandon the struggle.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

U.S. 'NEOGLOBALISM' AND LATIN AMERICA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 102-112

[Article by Valeriy Gennadiyevich Bushuyev, KOMMUNIST history department editor, candidate of historical sciences]

[Text] The scandal which has broken out in the United States in connection with the "Irangate," has revealed with new emphasis the aggressive nature of the policy which Washington's ruling circles describe as "neoglobalism."

Secret shipments of weapons to Iran and illegal transfers of some of the funds earned from such arms sales to counterrevolutionary gangs of Nicaraguan rebels have shed once again a bright light on the antipeople's adventuristic trend of the course pursued by the present American administration toward independent and sovereign countries which, for one reason or another, have triggered the displeasure of the true masters of America—the multinational corporations and the U.S. military-industrial complex. In an effort to halt the process of progressive change in the world and turn the course of history back, imperialism is relying ever more openly on the use of force, intervention in the affairs of countries which have gained their freedom and independence and exacerbation of regional conflicts.

Under contemporary conditions, the concept of "neoglobalism," the material support and strike force of which are the multinational corporations, has become the most general manifestation of the policy of colonialism and militarism. In exposing the nature of this policy which, in the final account, is aimed at extracting the national wealth and resources of developing countries, in his New Delhi address M.S. Gorbachev noted that "This includes setting some countries against others, exacerbating conflicts which break out, military actions, state terrorism against unsuitable regimes, training, arming and financing all kinds of "contras," separatists and terrorists, economic blockades and the slavery of indebtedness; a variety of political and ideological subversions and intrigues,... interference in domestic political struggles and other efforts to undermine progressive regimes from within."

As indicated by the recent course of events, the ruling elite in Washington is still nurturing illusions of American "total permissiveness," the possibility

of social revenge and establishing global U.S. hegemony. The export of counterrevolution, and the creation and support of all kinds of mutinous antigovernmental groups in developing countries with a progressive orientation are considered, in the light of the concept of "neoglobalism" by Washington, as nothing more than "low-intensity conflicts." In other words, to the current American administration such a policy is the "least costly," allegedly unrelated to any "major risk," in an effort, step by step, to reduce to naught the successes and achievements of anti-imperialist forces and to prove the "reversibility" of the progressive changes which have taken place in the world after World War II.

Today the strategists of "neoglobalism" have targeted above all the peoples of Nicaragua, Angola, Afghanistan, Cambodia and other countries which have taken the path of strengthening their national independence and progressive development. Tomorrow any other country which has decided to exercise its sovereign right to independently choosing its development, free itself from imperialist dependence and make necessary socioeconomic changes in the interest of the people's masses, may find itself the victim of the arbitrary behavior of American imperialism and provocations of dangerous military adventures.

The aggressive and counterrevolutionary nature of Washington's neoglobalist course, which takes the aspect of continuous reprisals against leaders and activists of democratic and patrioti organizations and movements, support of extreme reactionary forces and fascist regimes, promotion of extreme anticommunism and anti-Sovietism, efforts to divide and split progressive anti-imperialist forces, promotion of secret operations aimed at political and economic destabilization of legitimate governments, and so on, is manifested throughout the world, wherever, in the course of the struggle waged by the people's masses, the interests and privileges of American multinational corporations (MNC) and banks (MNB) arise and where prospects for positive shifts and changes develop. Latin America is one of the permanent targets of Washington's aggressive expansionistic policy.

The processes of social development, which are taking place in Latin American countries, clearly prove the accuracy of V.I. Lenin's scientific prediction. He proved that the struggle waged by the peoples for liberation from foreign oppression is not only national in content and not only carries within it a general democratic charge but also inevitably "turns against capitalism and imperialism...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 44, p 38).

The struggle waged by the people's masses in Latin America against the aggressive and interventionist course pursued by U.S. imperialist circles on the continent, for the overthrow of dictatorial regimes imposed by Washington and for democracy and social progress, is intensifying. The increasingly active role which the working class plays in this struggle contributes to the intensification of the militant nature of actions taking place on the scale of the entire area.

Despite Washington's efforts to maintain military-political and economic control over Latin American countries and to isolate them from the main trends

developing in the world, they are ever more daringly defending their political independence and national sovereignty. Their international reputation has increased substantially and so have their role and insignificance in global politics and economics; a number of governments have increased their opposition to the predatory neocolonialist policy pursued by American imperialism and the struggle for establishing a new international economic order based on equality, justice and mutual benefit. The continental unity of Latin American countries is strengthening and their joint actions against the methods of exploitation and pressure, practiced by the United States, such as unequal trade, protectionist barriers, dumping, financial-economic and trade blockade, the victims of which are Cuba and Nicaragua, are becoming increasingly frequent.

The already strong tangle of contradictions existing between Latin America and the United States is becoming increasingly more complex and confused as a result of the appearance of a set of most crucial problems triggered by the objective course of capitalist development in the region, which is worsened by dependence on imperialism. New insoluble conflicts developing within the United States appear and, literally under our very eyes, become aggravated in the case of Brazil, the Latin American giant, which is the eighth most industrialized country in the capitalist world. Contradictions are increasing in a number of other countries in the area in which, despite the lagging and deformation of capitalist development, a domestic industrial base has been created, some positions have been gained on domestic and foreign markets, the lines of the national reformist bourgeoisie have strengthened and trends have appeared toward production and capital concentration and centralization with, in frequent cases, an accelerated development of the governmental economic sector.

The imperial ambitions and self-seeking policy of American multinational monopolies, the brusque refusal by the U.S. ruling elite of taking into consideration the interests of its junior, weaker and dependent partners, the constant curtailment of opportunities for the growth of national accumulations caused by the ever increasing export of profits, cannot fail to concern that part of the ruling classes in those countries which is not directly related to MNC and MNB interests. Unwilling to be satisfied any longer with their assigned role of third-rate partners of the United States, the ruling circles in some of these countries are displaying today, with different degrees of resolve and consistency, the aspiration to protect their national interests from the overwhelming influence of the MNC and the extremism of international reaction.

The interconnection among the struggle for peace, strengthening international security, curbing the arms race unleashed by imperialism and successful opposition to Washington's expansionist and neoglobalist policy has become a characteristic feature of our time and a subject of growing understanding by Latin American and other developing countries. By their increasingly active support of nuclear disarmament, strengthening international security, and political settlement of regional conflicts, including those in Central America, and by taking practical steps in defense of their national sovereignty and political and economic independence, the Latin American

countries are making a substantial contribution to the solution of the main problem which faces mankind--the preservation of peace on earth.

The political forces, which are drawn into the struggle for peace and the true national liberation of Latin America by the very course of social development, are exceptionally disparate. Equally disparate are the ideological concepts, aspirations and potential which separate them, based on their social status and practical experience. The main thing, however, is that their enhanced participation in the anti-imperialist movement, which is assuming its specific features in the individual countries in the continent, is creating a qualitatively new situation in Latin America, weakening the system of U.S. domination. The struggle waged by the popular masses opens to the Latin American countries prospects for liberation from imperialist dependence, successful solution of general democratic problems and gradual future progress toward a higher stage of development of the revolutionary process and the reorganization of society on a socialist basis.

In the words of R. Arismendi, the noted figure of the internationalist communist and worker movements and secretary general of the Uruguayan Communist Party Central Committee, "This continent, which is a classical example of dependence, as it was defined by Lenin, has become an 'acting character' in the revolutionary transformation of the world."

Lenin cautioned against failure to understand "the link between revolution and counterrevolution." He taught us to see them as "a single social movement developing according to its inner logic" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 16, p 119). Historical practice confirms that one way or another any revolution is invariably accompanied by counterrevolutionary sallies. The very development of the revolutionary process motivates the counterrevolutionary forces to enhance their efforts. It would be an error to present the enemies of the revolution as some kind of static force unable to simulate or to adapt to constantly changing conditions and to the use of new methods of struggle in pursuit of its class objectives. Lenin repeatedly pointed out the need to take into consideration the ability of the reaction, which is suffering defeats, to learn from its own errors "with the greatest possible eagerness." Nor should we forget Lenin's statement that in frequent cases "The class instinct and class awareness of the ruling classes remain higher than the self-awareness of the oppressed classes" (op. cit., vol 44, p 40). The bourgeoisie "learned from the Russian example and will not allow to be 'caught unawares'" (ibid., p 99), Lenin cautioned.

Naturally, the U.S. imperialist circles did not fail to draw necessary conclusions also from the Cuban revolution, the successes of Popular Unity in Chile, the victory of the people's revolution in Nicaragua and the failures which occurred in some Latin American countries (Peru, Panama) which had relied on the armed forces. It is steadily keeping in its sights those who are raising in Latin America the banner of the struggle for independence, democracy and peace.

For many years, particularly during the more than 25 years since the victory of the Cuban revolution, imperialism has tried to control the development of literally all aspects of social life in Latin America. Washington is

formulating all sorts of programs for preventive struggle against the revolutionary and liberation movements in these countries. It is training cadres of punitive forces and is directly participating in suppressing the activities of progressive and democratic forces on the continent.

The effort to bring the revolutionary process in Latin American countries to a standstill at all costs and to keep them in a state of neocolonial bondage is greatly linked to the interests which American MNC and MNB have in this part of the world, and which is increasing with every passing year. In the past decade alone profits extracted by U.S. monopolies from Latin America and the Caribbean have exceeded their initial investments by a factor of more than 8. The Latin American countries are now reluctant "exporters" of capital. Between 1982 and 1985 the net outflow of resources from the area to the centers of capitalism totaled \$106 billion. Meanwhile, the net influx of capital invested in Latin American countries dropped from \$10.3 billion in 1984 to \$4.7 billion in 1985; the net outflow of capital resources which the countries in that area transferred abroad within that period of time increased from \$25.8 to \$30.4 billion.

The roughshod exploitation of Latin American countries by imperialism through nonequivalent trade and exchange, machinations and arbitrary changes in interest rates, and indebtedness have made the economic development of the area come to a standstill and contributed to the increased poverty and deprivation of the people's masses and the aggravation of social tension. In the 1980-1985 period the per capita GNP in Latin America dropped by 9 percent; there was a ubiquitous and significant drop in real wages; the pace of business slowed down substantially and the already exceptionally high dynamics of inflationary processes accelerated even further. In many aspects the crisis which shook up the regional economy and which was the most severe in a century set Latin American and Caribbean countries many years back (see PRISMA LATINOAMERICANO, June 1986, p 42). The already tremendous number of people suffering from hunger and poverty increased by approximately another 20 million; unemployment has affected 40 percent of the urban and 67 percent of the rural population on the continent.

Obviously, this situation cannot continue forever. The worsening socioeconomic crisis is the material foundation for the revolutionary process and helps the growth of the liberation and anti-imperialist struggle waged by the people's masses in Latin America. It is not surprising that, according to American foreign policy strategists, who have looked at prospects of global development for the next 50 years, "A cataclysm in the third world and south of our border may present a most serious threat to the United States" (US NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 9 May 1983, p A36). Among others, this leads to the conclusion that imperialist efforts at reducing and eliminating this "threat," i.e., pursuing a policy of exporting counterrevolution and suppressing liberation movements south of the Rio Grande, will continue to be the main trend of the course pursued by the United States in Latin America.

The counterrevolutionary strategy of the Reagan administration was clearly manifested in its approach to problems of Central America and the Caribbean. Growing American intervention in the internal affairs of this Latin American subregion, which Washington customarily considers the "backyard" of the United

States, is motivated by the fact that the development of the revolutionary liberation struggle in it threatens the military-strategic interests of the United States itself. Reprisals against patriotic and democratic movements in Central American and Caribbean countries, such as the U.S. criminal intervention in Grenada in 1983, should, according to imperialist plans, provide a tangible lesson to the progressive forces on the continent and constitute a specific implementation of the doctrine of "neoglobalism." As acknowledged by Z. Brzezinski, the frank apologist of Washington's imperial policies, "The American military invasion of Granada clearly proved the revived U.S. aspiration to use force in the region" (Z. Brzezinski, "Game Plan." Boston/New York, 1986, p 96).

The search for and use of any means of putting an end to the people's revolution in Nicaragua has become a kind of "obsession" of the administration in Washington. The more successful this revolution develops and the more obvious the support of the Sandinista by the country's popular masses becomes and the more its international prestige is enhanced, the more impudent American interference in Nicaraguan affairs becomes.

The overthrow of the Somoza family dictatorship, which was imposed on the country by the United States and, with its help, remained in power for nearly half a century, and liberation from imperialist dependence freed the Nicaraguans and enabled them, within a short time, to achieve, particularly in the social and political areas, something which to this day the peoples of neighboring Central American countries do not even dare to dream about. Unquestionably, Sandinista success would have been even greater had the constructive plans of the people's government not been violated by the undeclared war which U.S. imperialism unleashed in 1981.

The United States is trying to squeeze Nicaragua in a vise through the actions of counterrevolutionary mercenaries, who go deep into Nicaraguan territory and disturb normal life in many areas, and through its financial and commercial blockade, thus force the Sandinistas to capitulate, to frustrate the revolutionary process and turn the country back into a dependence on imperialism. The same objectives are pursued by Washington in provoking armed conflicts in the border areas of Nicaragua and in trying to dictate to the Nicaraguans conditions for "stabilizing" the situation along their borders by abandoning the gains of the Sandinista revolution. Armed and economic piracy is paralleled by a dirty propaganda campaign the purpose of which is to defame the ideals and achievements of the people's revolution and to depict the Sandinistas as a kind of fanatical terrorists engaged in "spreading the revolution" in neighboring countries.

Characteristically, as they reject the slanderous charges made by the Reagan administration against Nicaragua, even many American bourgeois researchers are forced to admit that the real reasons for the almost panicky fear of the U.S. ruling circles of the possibilities of a successful development of the Nicaraguan revolution are not found in the least in a far-fetched Sandinista "intervention" in the affairs of other Central American countries and, naturally, not the notorious "suppression" of democracy and freedoms in Nicaragua itself, which Washington loves to blabber about without any grounds whatsoever. "The threat created by Nicaragua," frankly say realistically

thinking U.S. scientists, "... includes the potential success of its campaign to eliminate illiteracy, its agrarian reforms and other steps aimed at the redistribution of wealth and improvements in the living conditions of the people's masses" (R. Armstrong and J. Shenk. "El Salvador. The Face of Revolution." London and Boston, 1982, p 221).

The main threat presented by the anti-Nicaraguan course charted by the Reagan administration is that, as it appropriates more and more funds for help to the "contras," it tries to legalize state terrorism and to free the hands of the CIA in the war against Nicaragua. By themselves, the "contras" are helpless. They have no chances whatsoever of overthrowing the Sandinista government. That is why, under the cover of cynical views on the need to help the "freedom fighters," the U.S. administration is planning broad subversive operations under the direct control of American special services. The White House has instructed the CIA to unite the disparate Somoza gangs and to assume control over all armed operations in Nicaragua, thus contributing to the further escalation of the conflict in all of Central America. The immediate objective of the "contras" would be to seize even a small piece of Nicaraguan territory, so that Washington could put together a "new government" consisting of its puppets and loudly proclaim the "triumph of democracy." This could provide a possibility of a large-scale American intervention in Nicaragua, which would be the fourth consecutive one in this century.

In extracting ever new appropriations for the support of the Somoza throat cutters, the White House is also pursuing entirely clear objectives concerning the peaceful settlement of the conflict, hoping to strike a blow against the activities of the Contadora group, which was set up in 1983 by Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama. This group, as well as the "support group" (Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay) actively favors peace in Central America based on a rejection of the policy of diktat and interference, which would include Washington's support of anti-Sandinista forces, and the resolution of disputes through talks.

Demonstrative scorn for peace loving and constructive initiatives by Latin American diplomacy, an obstructionist position taken toward the Contadora process and unwillingness to honor the demand of the World Court of ending its violations of Nicaraguan sovereignty and independence are all features which expose the administration in Washington, acting through its obedient puppets—the Salvadoran and Honduran regimes above all—as a fierce opponent of a political settlement in the subregion. Relying on the methods of military force in Central America, the White House has hurled a challenge not only to the Contadora group but to virtually all of Latin America which, despite hesitations and inconsistencies displayed by bourgeois ruling circles, is trying to solve a conflict situation through talks, without outside interference.

The policy of state terrorism pursued by the administration in Washington is manifested to its fullest extent in El Salvador as well. Having intervened in a war waged by the local reaction against the revolutionary democratic forces in that country, for a number of years the United States has been making tremendous efforts to defend and strengthen its positions in that country and to maintain in power its antipeople's regime which exists with U.S. help.

Hiding behind hypocritical considerations of "freedom," "democracy" and "humaneness" what is in fact a policy of most cruel reprisals over patriots and democrats is being pursued. Tens of thousands of innocent people have fallen victim to terrorism. In pursuit of purely imperial interests, the Reagan administration is defeating any attempts at a peaceful solution to the tragedy experienced by El Salvador.

Washington's broadening of the material base for unleashing a major armed conflict in Central America, condemned by global public opinion, could have fatal consequences not only for Latin America. Such a development of events will inevitably affect the general international situation. That is why, in firmly condemning the escalation of U.S. aggressive policy in Central America, the USSR has proclaimed its firm solidarity with the right cause of the people of Nicaragua, insisting that disputes and conflicts in that part of the planet, as in the rest of the world, are resolved through political means with the strict respect for the rights of each nation to its independent development.

The first half of the 1980s was noted in Latin America with a drastic intensification of the struggle waged by the masses for the restoration of democracy, violated by the reactionary military, strengthening national independence and improving living conditions of the working people. The literally entire continent has become an arena of tempestuous actions by the people's masses. Unquestionably, the struggle waged by the working class and the broad democratic and popular circles, and the painstaking and persistent work of the communists and their allies, which required of all of them persistence, firmness and, frequently, true heroism, was the main force which made the reaction retreat and agree to the restoration of bourgeois-democratic institutions.

The efforts of highly placed members of the administration in Washington, to present themselves as forces allegedly interested in democratic change in a number of Latin American countries or even actively contributing to the promotion of such changes are false and hypocritical. The entire historical experience in the development of the area in the 20th century irrefutably proves that, as a rule, in order to protect its positions and privileges, U.S. monopoly capital has tried to impose upon the Latin American nations dictatorial and repressive regimes which could maintain a strict control over the toiling masses. The fact that under the conditions of the political discrediting of proimperialist dictatorships, the aggravation of internal contradictions in the countries they control, the growth of crises in such countries and the exposure of the atrocities and violence committed by the military and the ability of right-wing authoritarian and fascist-leaning regimes to deal with their problems and, as in the past, curb people's and opposition regimes is drastically reduced is a different matter. Furthermore, at a given stage of development, such regimes even frequently become a burden which threatens to weaken the ruling coalition of ruling classes and to divide the armed forces, meanwhile objectively contributing to the growth of the democratic struggle of the masses.

Despite the superficial dissimilarity and specific features of the situation, it was this precise trend which has been followed in the development of events

in Bolivia, Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Guatemala and Haiti. The gravest possible economic and social problems have snowballed in these countries. All efforts to solve them with the help of International Monetary Fund prescriptions, applied for many years, only led to increased foreign indebtedness, a hindering of the pace of economic development, a mass impoverishment of the working people and the incalculable enrichment of a handful of oligarchies, closely related to multinational monopolies and banks.

The situation in the individual Latin American countries illustrates each one in its own way the profound crisis which affects today the system of neocolonial oppression on the continent. Forced to abandon dictatorial regimes in a number of countries and to agree to the restoration of formal bourgeois democracy and parliamentary, trade union and political activities, imperialism is resorting to some superficially modernized yet essentially unchanged methods for maintaining its domination over Latin America. Washington is doing everything possible to hinder real and profound democratization, cut off the people's revolutionary alternative and instill even more actively in the awareness of the masses anticommunist prejudices. In Washington's views, such concepts should hinder the course of the democratic process in the area and, in particular, divide the opposition and subvert efforts at unification and unity of action among antidictatorial forces in Chile and Paraguay and impose Duvalierism without Duvalier in Haiti.

Should the intensification of the democratic process nonetheless occur, thus threatening the foundations of imperialist domination, the United States has always on the ready its usual arsenal of means of pressure and interference. All levers for applying outside pressure on unruly Latin American countries are kept in a full state of readiness: subversive activities, launching CIA "secret operations," blackmail based on the tremendous indebtedness of Latin America, unequal trading conditions, etc., etc.

The forces of pressure from within, closely related to imperialism, have by no means disappeared. The right-wing and reactionary circles in these countries have not lost their aggressiveness. The higher-ranking military have not stopped thinking of conspiracies and revenge (as confirmed by the Argentine rebellion in April 1987). In the majority of cases, nor have the antipeople's military doctrines imposed by the Pentagon been revised. The agrarian, industrial and financial oligarchy is doing everything possible to destabilize the bourgeois democratic governments which have come to power, to divide them and to use all possibilities of triggering chaos in the economy and to create an atmosphere favoring a reactionary coup d'etat and a return to the old blessed times. Right wing extremist terrorist gangs are being used ever more actively in dealing with patriots and democrats. Maneuverings and machinations related to the unprecedented indebtedness incurred by the Latin American countries, which had reached almost \$400 billion by the beginning of 1987, are now being assigned a special role in the strategic plans of imperialism.

Capital exports have always played an exceptionally important role in the system of capitalist economic relations. Lenin described them as one of the most essential foundations of imperialism (see op. cit., vol 27, p 397). Exports of capital continue to play a prime role in increasing the power of

U.S. banking and industrial monopolies and "creating an international network of dependencies and relations among financial capital" (see *ibid.*, p 358).

Over a period of 70 years capital exports in Latin America have taken essentially the form of private loans and credits. Powerful financial groups of imperialist countries, the United States above all, actively used MNB operations in support of MNC expansion. Demand for borrowed capital by Latin American countries, particularly petroleum importers, contributed to the changes which took place at the start of the 1970s in petroleum prices, which entailed an increase in international cash flows. Demand for such cash was met by the MNB, which immediately saw in the expansion of loan operations not only a source of fabulous profits but also the possibility of acquiring a powerful lever with which to pressure Latin American and other developing countries.

The extensive use of high-cost loans resulted in unparalleled financial enslavement of Latin America. Producing absolutely nothing and contributing little to regional economic development but fully contributing to the new enslavement of the countries in the region and extracting from them to an increasing extent vitally necessary funds, the MNB brilliantly illustrate through their activities in Latin America Lenin's concept of "coupon clipping" by international financial capitalism as being the essence of "imperialism and imperialist parasitism" (*ibid.*, p 398).

Unquestionably, the course charted by multinational corporations and banks, directed at the financial enslavement of Latin American countries, pursued far-reaching strategic objectives. First, using funds extracted, in particular, from its economically backward neighbors to the south, today the United States is able to solve some of its own economic difficulties and to finance its huge budget deficit which, as we know, has been the result of the unrestrained arms race unleashed by imperialism. Second, as Latin American researchers have pointed out, it is actually a question of developing a richest possible source of financial resources needed in the present stage of technological updating and restructuring of the entire capitalist system, largely accomplished precisely by extracting the huge amounts of funds needed for this purpose from independent economically backward countries.

Having enmeshed Latin America in a net of commercial indebtedness, the multinational corporations and banks are actually trying to establish a type of "international economic order" which will be entirely and exclusively suited to their own needs and selfish egotistical interests. They do not simply put Latin American and all developing countries in an extremely unfavorable, unequal and dependent situation within the system of the international capitalist division of labor but are also trying to perpetuate this situation. The line followed by imperialism is aimed at hindering the independent development of Latin American countries and intensifying their exploitation by multinational monopolies. It is hoped that as a result of such a policy, not only the economic but also the political independence of these countries will be initially limited and, in the final account, emasculated, reduced to a minimum, leading to the appearance of the new system of dependence.

Economic stagnation, which is the result of the financial hemorrhaging of the area, is seriously threatening political stability in many Latin American countries and undermining the fragile bourgeois democratic institutions which have barely been able to sink roots in a number of countries in the area. That is why the demands of progressive and patriotic circles of the Latin American public for an immediate revision of unequal relations with U.S. imperialism and deferring repayment and even forgiving the foreign indebtedness and debt interests are becoming increasingly persistent. Brazil's decision to halt for an indefinite period the paying of interest on its foreign debt, which has reached the sum of \$109 billion, was met with support in the area.

Throughout Latin American countries an understanding is growing that by continuing to act alone they would be unable to obtain concessions from the lenders and the powerful international banks and that all imperialist "initiatives" in the credit-financial area are exclusively aimed at dividing the debtor-countries, avoid serious political talks with them and preserve and strengthen the role of the IMF as a financial policeman.

The dialectics of the current situation in Latin America is such that, having created an apparently reliable lever for pressuring the Latin American countries with the help of their huge indebtedness and a means of controlling their economic and political development, imperialism has unwittingly helped the creation of objective circumstances which are encouraging the masses to increase their opposition to the arbitrary behavior of international banks and monopolies, and to intensify the struggle against hunger and poverty and for the soonest possible implementation of deep and progressive changes.

Interventionism and subversive activities, power pressure and threats of armed intervention, and economic blackmail and indebtedness have all been used by U.S. imperialism to curb the development of the process of change in Latin America. In encouraging the wave of chauvinism which has engulfed some U.S. population strata, and proclaiming America's "total permissiveness," the ruling circles in Washington have raised the neoglobalist policy of export of counterrevolution to the rank of state doctrine. The present U.S. administration cannot let its imperial ambitions rest or abandon its aspiration to solve the problems which have piled up in Latin America by force. At all cost it wants to turn it into a huge neocolonialist reserve. Irresponsible efforts by the inspirers of the U.S. neoglobalist course to draw public attention away from the "Irangate" scandal by promoting militaristic campaigns, increasing its subversive and interventionist activities in Central America and saber rattling in the Eastern Mediterranean or the Persian Gulf, are generating particular concern throughout the world.

How not to recall at this point Marx's prophetic words that as capitalism develops and matures the general tendency of the imperialist bourgeoisie to resort "to barbarism assumes a methodical nature; immorality is raised to the level of a system, illegality finds its legislators and the right of the fist its own code" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 13, p 434). In describing the new historical circumstances of the existence of a "war party" in the imperialist countries, Lenin exposed its fundamental political

principle: "Force must be used instantly, whatever the subsequent consequences may be" (op. cit., vol 36, p 333).

The aggressive and adventuristic course charted by U.S. imperialism is a convincing example of the embodiment of this simple "principle" observed by international reaction.

The hegemonistic aspirations and the self-serving interests of the ruling elite in the United States clash violently with the vital interests of the peoples of the world. The use by Washington of methods of military-political and economic terrorism, its stubborn unwillingness to solve disputes through talks, under circumstances of equality and mutual respect between partners and the desire to push things to a dead end, to block or promote conflict situations and to extract from them maximal advantages are all specific manifestations of the reactionary ideology which guides imperialism in considering the world exclusively as a realm of application of its antipeople's narrow egotistical interests. This is a vestige of prenuclear thinking, gravely endangering the future of mankind.

Nonetheless, the situation which has developed in the world urgently demands a sober and realistic approach and a new way of political thinking consistent with the realities of the nuclear century and the rejection of power methods in solving international problems which must be settled exclusively by political means. As M.S. Gorbachev noted, "The new way of thinking which is needed by the contemporary world is incompatible with the concept of the world being someone's patrimony, attempts to extend to others the 'blessings' of his guardianship and admonitions as to how to behave and what way to choose-- socialist, capitalist or any other."

The time has come to eliminate and reject concepts which were typical in the past according to which the international policies and social destinies of the billions of people in Latin American, Asian and African countries could be determined by the selfish interests of a country or group of countries. Ensuring a lasting peace, in which mankind is vitally interested, is inseparably related today to the equitable settlement of regional conflicts and the global solution of problems of development, economic backwardness and external indebtedness of developing countries, the establishment of a new international economic order and constructive interaction among all countries and states. The elimination of imperialist interference and the acknowledgment of the inviolable right of nations to freedom, independence and democracy or, in short, the right to social progress would make a world cleansed from nuclear weapons truly safe, just and democratic.

Despite the threat presented by U.S. neoglobalists, the peoples of Latin America are fully resolved to assert their legitimate right to the independent formulation of their own destinies and the implementation of right changes and intensified regional integration and diversification of foreign economic relations, including the development of equal and mutually profitable cooperation with the socialist world, strive to strengthen international law and order and ability to oppose Washington's power politics. Naturally, the main battles waged on the continent for profound democratization and total national and social liberation lie ahead. Nowhere in the world, including

Latin America, has the course of social change ever been or could be simple and direct. International reaction is still able, in some cases, as in Chile and Granada, to regain temporarily its positions, thus dooming the nations to new disasters and suffering. However, it can no longer suppress the liberation struggle of the masses or, even less so, formulate any realistic alternative to profound social changes. Although the United States still has a substantial influence in Latin America, this continent cannot be considered a reliable rear line of American imperialism. Both here and elsewhere on earth, in the final account, the failure of Washington's neoglobalist course is inevitable.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

PROFILE OF A READER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 113-122

[Article by Oleg Vasilyevich Kuprin, department deputy editor of KOMMUNIST]

[Text] In the first 3 months of 1987, i.e., in the first quarter of the year, KOMMUNIST received as many letters as in the entire 1984.

We take the year 1984 as a basis for comparison. A substantial increase in editorial mail was noted in 1985, after the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum. The greatest increase was noted in the first quarter of this year. This is not only a result of our journalistic searches and innovations. What is changing is the psychological climate in the country. Openness is being asserted and the process of democratization is gathering pace and, hence, so does the growth of social activeness, reflected in the number and quality of mail addressed to KOMMUNIST and to other journals. It is no accident that this year the central press and journals, including KOMMUNIST, increased the number of their subscribers by more than 14 million. This is no trifle. It indicates the major changes which are taking place in the social consciousness, in the nature of the attitude of the people toward the press and in their mentality.

A New Section

Any editor would be pleased with increased activeness among the readers. We hoped that this would happen and tried to guess at the number. We were pleasantly wrong. The "mail boom on the editorial scale" is now becoming an item on the agenda of the editors and at production conferences. Currently letters are published in each issue in a separate section entitled "In My Opinion..." and readers' suggestions are discussed and argued about.

Let me point out that the editors classify as a letter any manuscript received by mail. Therefore, this is a rather elastic concept, for it can range from several lines to hundreds of pages. Here is one of the briefest: "Thank you very much for publishing the article 'Militarism and Contemporary Society' by Academician G. Arbatov (KOMMUNIST No 2, 1987). The discussion of whether capitalism would be able to abandon militarism 'in principle' should be continued" (G. Nemirya, Donetsk). The longest manuscript was sent by N.

Dabudek from Cherkassy, 462 pages of single-spaced text. The editors request that a manuscript not exceed 20-25 pages. This is not a formal rule but an operational requirement.

Those who produce the journal would very much like to know for whom they are working and with what attitude people approach various materials. We already know something about it. For example, two authors have sincerely described the way they read issue No 4 of KOMMUNIST. Here is what writes Yu. Martyshchenko from Novosibirsk: "I skimmed through the editorial quickly: There was nothing new. The same applied to several other articles. I read with increased attention the article by O. Iatsis and A. Sozinov and the talk with A. Buzhinskiy." The author of this letter reports that he is particularly interested in socialist political economy, "above all 'self-generating' contradictions as a source of development."

The reaction of Muscovite A. Ashurkov was entirely different: "I was very satisfied with the editorial in No 4. Briefly and directly you described something which had long concerned the Soviet people and had been denied the possibility of expressing. I personally had felt this for many years."

Yu. Pyshkin (Moscow Oblast) picked up by accident the last issue for 1986 at a newsstand. "I read and was amazed. These were not articles but entire discoveries. The journal has assumed firm positions in a daring debate. I went through the whole journal, cover to cover, in one breath, after which I hastened to take a subscription." We thank you for this assessment and for your support, although we do not look at our journal in such rosy colors.

As we read the letters we feel the close, exigent and critical views and greater attention and wonder if this leap in the editorial mail is not accidental. Naturally, it is pleasant to come across a statement such as "Unquestionably, KOMMUNIST has become much more meaningful and interesting" (V. Uvarov, Kiev). However, sincerely, we do not flatter ourselves and, as we pointed out, do not take the entire credit.

Today the journalists feel a sharp need to be in close touch with the readers in order to be able tangibly to judge of the dynamics of public opinion and the complex phenomena of our reality which interest the Soviet people. This led to the suggestion of opening a new section: "Feedback: Reader To Journal." In the first survey of letters it will be a question of those who are currently reading this issue, who regularly receive the journal by mail, who buy copies at newsstands or read the journal in a public library. For the time being it is impossible to provide a somewhat accurate general portrait of our reader. We leave this to the sociologists. They have already taken over one of the editorial premises. The present survey is an effort to depict the reader on the basis of his letters and thoughts on the editorial mail, in its hot traces, as the saying goes. This is in no way a portrait but, rather, a sketch, an outline of a portrait.

The Sharp Angles of Restructuring

It would be hard to find in the editorial mail a letter not mentioning the word "restructuring." We find it in the numerous responses to the journal's

publications. We find it in articles by economists, philosophers, historians and art experts, and in complaints. We have received several poems on restructuring. Incidentally, the readers should know that the journal does not publish poems, novels, stories or novellas (including documentary works); there are literary and artistic publications for such materials.

We are in favor of restructuring! Virtually all authors of letters to the editors could sign such a statement. However, the evaluation of the changes occurring in the country show differences, some of which quite substantial.

The largest number of letters dealing directly with restructuring could be classified in a group under the joint title of "aggressively concerned." The target of their main attack is quite clear--bureaucraticism. A. Romanyuk, a worker from the Crimea, described it as the "quiet counterrevolution." Ya. Khaykin, a war and labor veteran from Voronezh, who discusses bureaucratism in the economy, considers the complete subordination of the production process to administrative management the main reason for deformations in this area, and explains his viewpoint as follows: "The main reason for this shortcut is the aspiration of the bureaucracy to preserve its power over the economy and thus to secure its privileged status in society."

Our readers address themselves to the materials of the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum and, pointedly and frequently cite the statement in M.S. Gorbachev's report: "It is only through democracy and thanks to democracy that restructuring itself is possible. Only thus can we provide scope for the most powerful constructive force of socialism--free labor and free thinking in a free country."

Restructuring through democratization is a party program which was adopted unanimously. However, its specific implementation is highlighting a number of difficulties and threats of distortion. The Voronezh reader, for example, cautions us that: "In pursuing the course of democratization one could expect excesses in relations between managers and managed. The most important thing in such cases is not to yield to panic. Working people will join the democratization process without the necessary experience, for which reason bureaucrats may use such excesses to their advantage. It is important in this case not to deviate from the course for any reason."

Alas, according to all available information, the number of such "excesses" has increased sharply, like the level of flooded rivers after heavy snowfall. This is initiated not only by bureaucrats but also by the "modest fighters for truth" (as some anonymous letter writers describe themselves). A second anonymous letter by the same author was received in the last quarter. With unconcealed pleasure the author describes the way a commission headed by a gorkom official debated an "urgent signal" (the letter to KOMMUNIST was written by a woman, a teacher). Meetings were held and heated debates took place. Naturally, the "modest fighter for truth" remained silent.

We do not ignore the fact that anonymous letters frequently prove the existence of an unhealthy situation in the collective where the anonymous letter originated, and the established "tradition" of persecuting someone for criticism. This regrettable fact is isolated. It is no secret, however, that

there also are "principle-minded" devotees of "secret" letters, supporters of the old slogan of "art for art's sake" (read "squabbling for its own sake").

Here is another collective opinion garnered from dozens of letters. It is roughly as follows: Many people feel optimism accompanied by doubt. The optimism is based on the truth which the party told the people. However, truth does not a stomach fill. Where are the real changes? So far one can only "sense" them in the press, plays and a few literary novelties. Nonetheless, these are only words. Has the restructuring not become mired in words, however accurate, daring and revolutionary they may be?

Not everyone makes an effort to make his views widely known. Some people are still somewhat afraid of their own thoughts and inclined to practice a kind of "self-censorship," for which reason I will not mention their names but instead talk only about those who do not fear to be frank. In the final account, this is not a question of names but of the fact that such moods (optimism plus doubts) exist and influence the shaping of public opinion and, therefore, demand serious analysis. Naturally, an analysis cannot be based on 20 or 30 statements. However, this should be enough to provide the outlines of a sharp problem, which is what I shall try to do.

This problem was most graphically pointed out by B. Maloy, chief of sector at a scientific research institute (Moscow). He addressed his letter to the writer V. Korotich in response to an article published in *KOMMUNIST* (No 4, 1987). I am quoting this letter with the author's permission:

"I think that our society is something like an iceberg. The restructuring which has begun (unfortunately not so intensively in fact as it is in words) has affected only the part of the iceberg above the water, the part which reacts both to the sun and the ocean waves. The features of its destruction may be more or less noticeable. Nonetheless, nine-tenths of the iceberg are underwater, where the temperature is constant and external factors have virtually no influence.

"Our leaders probably are familiar with all of this. I think that that may be the reason for which M.S. Gorbachev frequently turns to the simple working people in an effort to awaken their social activeness and awareness. This is quite proper, as is the course toward openness and democratization of society. One feels like a real person when one is frankly told the entire truth, including the sad and the unpleasant. This means that the person is trusted. This makes the people stronger.

"Democracy, however, is no simple matter. The majority of middle and low-management personnel have kept their jobs. Their support of restructuring is frequently fictitious. However, it is precisely this reaction that the people see, which does not strengthen their faith in restructuring."

In support of this statement I could cite dozens of complaints against managers on the levels mentioned by B. Maloy. This situation is probably familiar to many readers based on sad personal experience. Nonetheless, they give priority not to doubt but to optimism, persistently seeking a solution to the existing situation. The views contained in the editorial mail may be

summed up with Muscovite V. Smirnov's formula: We need a social mechanism which would block promotion to and keeping in leading positions noncreative people, not to mention careerists and swindlers. Other formulations exist as well but all of them invariably use the words "mechanism" and "system." This means something which should work for progress with the inevitability of a natural law and the efficiency of an impeccably designed automatic line. This, inarguably, is a splendid wish. All normal people without exception are "for" it. But what kind of mechanism should this be?

Here are some readers' suggestions: "People whose hearts and hands are dirty must be shaken loose and punished." Could it be that such "shaking loose" and punishment are insufficiently active? "The selection and appointment of cadres must be done not from the top to the bottom but from the bottom to the top. Managers must be elected by secret vote." This is already being done. "We must make use of our legislation and of many articles with which the citizens are unfamiliar and which apply to their rights." Such propaganda is under way. Let us improve it.

In short, many are the answers to the question of how to set up a mechanism which would contribute to the accelerated restructuring? However, even if we combine them, we would not have a uniform integral mechanism protected from major shortcomings. Perhaps the collective search should go on. Its direction was indicated by the party: democratization of all aspects of social life.

The record in the number of answers in recent months has been in reference to the article by academician T. Zaslavskaya "The Human Factor In The Development Of The Economy And Social Justice" (KOMMUNIST, No 13, 1986). A review of these responses has already appeared (No 3, 1987). However, letters on this topic keep coming. Many people give priority to the concept of "social justice," as a code in understanding "restructuring." Let us ignore sports terminology and waste no time in assigning "ratings" to problems of socioeconomic development. What concerns us is something else. Unequivocally, the readers express doubts: Will the editors abandon the critical style which distinguished said article? Others mention the "imminent decline of the fragile era of openness," and others again hasten to announce "its already existing twilight." I have no intention to persuade anyone that the Soviet press, including KOMMUNIST, has no intention to avoid sharp problems. The lovers of "twilights" should read in our journal the article by actor M. Ulyanov, for example (No 5, 1987).

Unquestionably, pulling down the walls around areas which were once safe from criticism is no simple matter. Those who have become accustomed to having their true or fictitious successes praised, sometimes quite sincerely, blend their personalities with the unshakable foundations of the Soviet system and consider any criticism addressed to them as almost a national tragedy. Such trends are visible quite bluntly and clearly among the creative intelligentsia, writers in particular, but not only among them.

A letter received from Sverdlovsk reads something like this: "Social injustice has assumed catastrophic dimensions." The only way suggested to surmount it is the following: immediately abolish and ban by law the

certification of cadres. The reason for such a categorical view is simple: its author failed in the certification and was dismissed.

It would be difficult to determine whether the decision of the certification commission was fair or unfair, for the author of the letter indicates neither his position nor place of work. The principle, however, is quite symptomatic: If something is inconsistent with my interests or affects my self-esteem, it should be eliminated on a national scale, be it certification, sharp literary criticism articles or even the entire restructuring. Any injustice, naturally, generates hurt, anger and the desire to strike back. Restructuring without struggle is inconceivable and restructuring itself must be protected. Alas, frequently that struggle turns into a clash of ambitions. Readers note that we are being frightened by "references to 'pouring grist in the enemy's mill,' forgetting that fear of truth is a confirmation of nothing but our own inferiority complex."

Let us be frank: Any drastic change may sometimes affect human destinies quite painfully. Even abandoning an old habit can bring about a certain spiritual discomfort for a while and losing a high position or the reassessment of values (including artistic) could be even harder. We frequently use two concepts as a pair: criticism and self-criticism. Currently we have more than enough criticism while self-criticism, sober self-criticism, is clearly in short supply. Is this not the reason for which there has been an increased flow of letters about various types of troublesome clashes and a drastic aggravation within society of the gap between the pressure of criticism and the very timid self-assessment of personal shortcomings? Is this not one of the stormy whirlpools of psychological restructuring? That is what makes so relevant today the party demand that everyone must begin with himself.

Our reader is right: Democracy is indeed no simple matter, not only on the national level but on the personal level as well.

How and About What to Argue

The reader disagrees with the journal, he questions, doubts, corrects authors of articles and, in short, actively joins in the discussion.... Letters of this nature have been numerous. In reorganizing the structure of the journal after the 27th CPSU Central Congress, we greatly relied precisely for such type of mail and we are pleased today by the aggressive (directed at us, editors and authors) activeness of the readers.

In the past 3 months the highest number of disagreements have been on works related to the question of individual labor activity. Without plunging into such polemics, which will be the subject of a special survey of editorial mail, let me merely mention the form it has acquired, not only in terms of this topic but of others as well. Letters to the editors and the participation of our associates in the discussion of a great variety of problems with a great variety of audiences proved that today, in the period of democratization of all aspects of social life, the standards of a debate become much more than simple formality. The journal's mail allows us to lay an entirely definite foundation for such discussions.

D. Mutagirov, professor and head of department of scientific communism in the natural science departments of Leningrad University, believes that laws on individual labor activity are being given a one-sided assessment in the press, most frequently an enthusiastic one. He expresses the view that this leads to a review of universally accepted evaluations of petty commodity output and refers to the article "Individual Labor and Common Benefit" which appeared in *KOMMUNIST* (No 18, 1986). "We would like," he writes, "that the problem be considered not only from the standpoint of the consumer of commodities and services, who frequently supports the slogan 'the more the better,' but also from the viewpoint of socialism as a social system."

The author does not merely engage in a polemical discussion but provides arguments in defense of his views and submits constructive suggestions, one of which is that of unused manpower resources in the country. Here is what he writes, for example, about the retired: "According to the laws of socialist society they deserve the right to rest. Millions of them, however, cannot conceive of life without active and constructive labor. They would like to continue to work at their old enterprises and establishments. Unfortunately, not all of them enjoy this right. After their retirement, many highly skilled intellectual workers are allowed to work only as workers, kolkhoz members or servicing personnel. Unquestionably, all work is honorable in a socialist society, but why does a scientist, an engineer or an inventor be forced in his old age to learn a new job. Is this work according to his capabilities?"

The author of this letter is a competent person. I repeat, the purpose of this survey is not to make any particular contribution to the debate which has been initiated by this journal. I hope, however, that this short description of the view held by this Leningrad scientist and excerpts from his manuscript will give an idea of the style, level and nature of the debate he is suggesting to the editors: a proper style, standards and nature.

A no less competent person, Dr of Economic Sciences O. Khvingiya (Tbilisi) further emphasizes the problem by describing distortions of cooperation in some parts of the republic. He cited the following example: "In terms of kolkhoz member earnings from public production, Georgia is the last in the country but first in income from private farming." The author backs each one of his concepts with statistics. To repeat, although I have no intention of passing a judgment on the manuscript as a whole, such a serious, sharp and aggressive approaches are noteworthy and merit respect.

This discussion has been joined by L. Lapshina, candidate of historical sciences, CPSU history department docent, Gorkiy Higher Party School. The article in No 18 for 1986 we mentioned she finds puzzling and raising many questions. Actually, her entire letter to the editors consists of 16 questions which she addresses to people who were interviewed by the journal's correspondent. Here is the first: "1. Why do you think that 'efforts to legally ban one type of individual activity or another' have impoverished the consumer goods and services market and reduced the retail trade network? Is the scarcity of good quality factory goods and products created by individual activities rather than the insufficient development of group 'B' and agriculture? We are short of factory goods and choices in buying shoes, clothing and farm products. Is this compensated by private entrepreneurs?"

This is one of her short questions. Some of them are much longer, covering almost two full typewritten pages. The author substantiates her disagreement, cites newspaper articles and quotes facts borrowed from scientific studies and very ordinary cases, including prices charged at markets in different cities. And although her questions are to the point and sometimes picky, her arguments are distinguished by tactfulness and respect for the knowledge and competence of her opponents.

I have described these letters in such detail because such a style is now extremely rare to find in the numerous discussions and "clarification of relations" in science and elsewhere. All too frequently these battles are waged under the slogan of "if your shoulder itches, swing your arm! This is not only a matter of the fact that elementary ethics calls for respecting other viewpoints. As a rule, a discussion hullabaloo simply prevents us from seriously considering the views held by the opposite side. Specifics, isolated sentences become topics of fierce arguments. Passions are boiling and doubtful but "murderous" labels keep pouring as though from a horn of plenty. Yes, it is true that without feelings no human quest for truth is possible. However, such quests must not be occasionally reduced to simple emotions or subordinated to them entirely. The editorial mail includes numerous examples of such "debating" style. I shall not mention the most noteworthy, for the most noteworthy are also indecent.

A reader from Rostov-na-Donu (who shall remain anonymous, for her letter must have been written in the heat of the moment) attacks an article by a noted professor, published in PRAVDA, and another one by an even greater academician, printed in KOMMUNIST. Both articles had triggered a profound and serious response among readers and led many people to profound thoughts on the grave problems of restructuring. As acknowledged by prestigious scientists and state and public figures, the article published in our journal was considered an example of broad and daring formulation of crucial problems of our development. The person from Rostov does not agree. She cites arguments according to which both articles have been interpreted carelessly. Actually, one must work hard to get to her arguments, peeling off entire layers of personal insults addressed at her opponents. The conclusion from this entire "polemic" does not go beyond generalities. To support my claim I have chosen one of the more acceptable quotes which sum up the author's idea: "No, citizens professor and academician (I cannot bring myself to calling them comrades)! We must create a type of conditions which will make all people on earth begin to envy the life of every Soviet citizen who lives in a country which not only allows him to be a Man, independently creating his destiny and aware of his own Personality, showing the deep feeling of a thrifty and concerned Master of his country...."

No one is forbidden from arguing with professors and academicians. But what is the point of a "discussion" of this kind?

Incidentally, many of the authors of letters on a great variety of problems of the social sciences, some of them most complex, present their own conclusions, with no lack of modesty, as the only true and inarguable ones. The logic is simple. Since in our country social scientists are abused, it means that they are worthless and one must "open their eyes to the truth." The study of the

works of such social scientists is not considered mandatory. One could glean two or three sentences from a newspaper or journal article and then undertake to create one's own theories and concepts and persistently demand that they be published. If the authors of such works receive a polite rejection, as a rule they feel insulted and accuse us of "subverting" openness and violating our own rules of debate.

Not everything submitted by our volunteer contributors can be printed, one of the reasons being space limitations. We choose as topics for discussion problems which, in our view, are most relevant and cover a broad range of problems rather than reduce them to a specific feature which may be very relevant to its author but is nevertheless of an private nature. Furthermore, in itself openness does not obligate newspapers and journals to publish absolutely everything they receive. For example, we have not published and are not about to publish the article by Muscovite L. Rendel (Biryukov) the purpose of which was to defame the life and works of A.S. Pushkin and to praise Tsar Nicholas I, although in answer to our refusal, the author accuses the editors of suppressing "any fresh idea, any attempt at practical criticism, any desire 'to remove simplistic gloss,' and any rejection of the eulogy of officialdom (referring to the great poet—author) or equal anathemizing of officialdom" (the tsar—author).

Unless a stream rushes down an ideally clean riverbed, flotsam is bound to appear on its surface. For that reason the purifying and socially necessary process of the assertion of openness cannot be easily protected from dirty flotsam. As we know, after stagnation an ideally clean riverbed is impossible. The bubbles of inflated sensationalism show up. This is achieved most easily by reviving old intrigues and rumors under the slogan of "removing simplistic gloss."

There are many problems worthy of discussion, needed by the people and useful in understanding today's restructuring. The journal invites anyone who so desire to participate in the polemics. But let us be civil about it.

The Answer of Science

The attitude toward social sciences, which was discussed in the previous part of this survey, is not the predominant topic of the readers. This is confirmed by publications in this journal. Numerous responses were received to the answer by P. Fedoseyev, USSR Academy of Sciences vice president (KOMMUNIST, No 18, 1986); a survey of these responses was published in No 5 for 1987, entitled "On Restructuring the Social Sciences." The scientists themselves, who acknowledged the validity of the criticism addressed to them, are trying to find the reasons for the lagging of their scientific sector. Let me cite one opinion.

"The task of Marxist-Leninist theory is to maintain a high projecting and forecasting potential, guiding the party's political line and social development along the channel of a more dynamic progress. Our social science must not resemble Hegel's image of philosophy, always behind the course of history, and which, like Minerva's owl, begins its flight with the falling of darkness. On the other hand, by no means is theory responsible for all

development difficulties, any more than we should blame those sociologists (there were not all that many of them) who frequently, to the detriment of their careers, did not betray scientific truth. Unfortunately, like some films their works could not break through the bureaucratic obstacles and become known not only to the scientific public but to the public at large" (N. Guzynin, Stavropol).

The author of this letter supports his colleagues who have appealed via the press for granting social scientists immediate access to the "caches" of information and suggests a revision of the status of sociologists and the significance of sociological research, the results of which "based on the objective surveys of broad public strata, must be not desirable but mandatory manuals for action by various administrative authorities in implementing resolutions and policies affecting all aspects of social activities."

A number of suggestions have been received. To a certain extent, we can judge of the relevance of a new idea by the number and quality of readers' responses. The editors were surprised by the reaction to a short letter sent by A. Markova and M. Solodkina entitled "Proper Attention to Economic History," with a comment by Academician A. Aganbegyan (KOMMUNIST, No 1, 1987). This material was discussed at departmental meetings of many VUZs and a number of suggestions were voiced. Here are a few of them: "Reprint the textbook 'History of Economic Theories,' which came out in a small edition" (T. Semenkova, Moscow). "Expand the lecture course on 'Economic History of the USSR and Foreign Countries' from 50 to 70 hours" (A. Roslyakov and T. Samedov, Ashkhabad). "Publish a quarterly which would become the coordinating center of methodical, scientific and organizational work in the field of economic history" (Yu. Gorshkov, Moscow). "Offer a course in economic history in all VUZs training social scientists and ideological workers" (S. Iauta and V. Seleznev, Kiev). Most such suggestions come from VUZ teachers. The reaction to this article was quick and extensive, for this is a topical question. Readers M. Bolbas (Brest), U. Erdniyev, M. Ivanov and S. Badmayev (Elista), S. Fuzaylov (Dushanbe), B. Madyshv (Alma-Ata), M. Graf, R. Yuksvyarav and E. Tarvel (Tallin), V. Viktorov, S. Zoyev and V. Sinelnikov (Groznyy), T. Pazhitnova (Leningrad), V. Lanin (Tyumen), Ye. Kondratenko (Voroshilovgrad) and others stress the need to solve without delay organizational problems of teaching economic history, enhance its status and intensify research in that area. The readers insist and urge. Meanwhile, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and other departments and organizations which should solve this problem are apparently not ready to do so.

It is impossible in a survey even to list all the suggestions related to restructuring the social sciences as a whole, not to mention its individual areas. This will be a matter for the future. We must point out, however, in order not to restrict excessively the range of interests of the readers or ignore an area of science the lagging in which reveals perhaps the greatest conceptual confusion of views, judgments, expectations, thoughts and prophecies: We are referring to history, not ancient but quite recent.

Any sharp turn in the destinies of the country, any major trial, naturally and legitimately triggers a sharp increase in the interest shown in domestic history. Why should the process of restructuring be any different?

Naturally, it should not, the more so since restructuring will require a real interpretation of our strong sides and the advantages of the socialist system, tested most harshly, as well as errors and negative phenomena which brought about the stagnation from whose tight clutches we must firmly free ourselves. Whereas not everyone should undertake to analyze the strictly economic aspect of stagnation phenomena, justifiably anyone who was alive at that time should consider himself a historian of that period. Understandably, the views and assessments of nonprofessional historians are based above all on their own personal experience. Since that experience is quite heterogeneous, public opinion is being literally torn apart by contradictions.

Here is a vivid example: The motion picture "Repentance" is considered, unquestionably, as a major artistic phenomenon. It received many positive reviews. Here is one: Georgian cinematographers "have proved to all of us that one must not play games with history. History may advance or even develop away from progress. It stand still or retreat sharply into the past, almost to medieval times" (Yu. Pilipchuk, Lvov).

Negative references, in my view, lead to more serious thoughts. Here is what wrote Muscovite Ye. Solopin: "It is one thing when the party itself not only exposes its errors but also firmly eliminates them. Clearly, if they are not identified they cannot be removed. It is a different matter when the party's omissions and errors are persistently, for decades (?) being relished by talented artists.... From a loyal assistant of the party, such art becomes an accuser of the socialist system.... We are aware of how profoundly negative phenomena have penetrated our reality. The philistine has become accustomed to blaming the party itself for this. However, the culprits are the artists who, for decades, promoted drunkenness, irresponsibility, and impunity, who corrupted the working class, turning it into a waste maker.... As the folk saying goes, good things must be remembered forever and bad things must be forgotten instantly."

I have cited these two letters not in order to start an argument the one and agree with the other, but to show the depth of contradictions which are dividing our concepts of domestic history and help the readers to realize the way such contradictions are preventing many people from understanding the nature of change and becoming active promoters of the strategic ideas of restructuring: democratization and openness. That is why the public is especially concerned with history which is a stern judge and which makes firm demands.

Docent V. Shpindler from Odessa believes that adaptation to circumstances and open embellishment of reality has prevailed in interpreting the history of the Soviet period, particularly as of the mid-1930s. This was done directly or indirectly in a number of works, some of which published as late as 1986. In his view, this particularly applies to the VUZ textbook on CPSU history and other social science manuals which are frequently reprinted.

The author of this letter raises another important question. Why is it that for a long time the science of history has ignored perhaps modest but nonetheless some achievements in the field of domestic social psychology? Such self-limitations lead to the depersonalization of history and make a

significant percentage of historical works boring and insipid. Without interconnection with history we cannot explain the origin of negative phenomena such as money grubbing, bribery, reverence of even the most vulgar outcrops of bourgeois mass culture, drunkenness and drug addiction. At this point, the author of the letter believes, historians are lagging behind fiction and essays. It is their work and their direct obligation to explain the origins of the social and moral erosion which has occurred in our society and which has been described in many talented works by writers and essayists.

More than ever before today we need the truth about our recent past. This thought runs through dozens of letters to the editors. Some of them, as though joining in a conspiracy, quote the same passage in this journal's editorial in issue No 10 for 1986: "The point is that the cult of personality and subjectivistic and voluntaristic decisions caused a great deal of ideological-political and material harm in building the new society, hindered the initiative and activity of cadres and aggravated senseless bureaucratic obedience." The writers quote, support and agree, and then add: We must describe the moral consequences of the cult of personality, such as total permissiveness displayed by managers on different levels, fear of openness, flattery and toadiness, time-serving and nepotism. These writers quote passages, express their discontent with the scant formulations and demand the unraveling and expanded analysis of such phenomena, believing this to be necessary in order to accelerate restructuring. They quote, argue and submit specific suggestions and ask questions. Let me cite a few. Could we consider today adequate and exhaustive the CPSU Central Committee decree "On Surmounting the Cult of Personality and its Consequences?" Does it not fail to expose the entire nature of this phenomenon? Have we been too hasty in proclaiming its elimination? The authors of two letters suggest the following: to reprint the minutes of party congresses and conferences which have become bibliographic rarities and to publish those which have never been published; to offer the readership at large the possibility to study the recollections of V.I. Lenin's fellow workers, published in the 1920s and 1930s. Their comments are as follows: "Without a thorough settling of past accounts we cannot hope for an honest future." "This will enable every party member to study the history of his party based on prime sources" (A. Chernenko, Dnepropetrovsk).

Another facet of the same problem is highlighted by S. Kornilova, candidate of philosophical sciences and head of raykom department in Sverdlovsk: "We are concerned by the fact that many people consider the study of history as self-seeking rather than a means of shaping and developing a communist outlook.... The task of education through history is to learn how to think in specific historical terms through the study of historical facts, i.e., to be able to see the objective and to assess any event from the viewpoint of advancing toward the target... Our sociopolitical literature frequently fails to analyze and teach how to evaluate certain historical events and to note their role in social development instead of simply enumerate them."

Qualities of Leadership

The editors have received a large number of long articles as well as modest notes written under the impression of the January CPSU Central Committee

Plenum. The readers comment on some ideas contained in M.S. Gorbachev's report and cite examples confirming the accuracy and exceptional timeliness of the decisions which were made. They make suggestions which are sometimes wrong. Incidentally, in some cases even mistakes quite eloquently indicate the nature of a person's thoughts and convictions.

The work style of the soviets is discussed in the letter of V. Karanin from Novosibirsk Oblast. He believes that they make insufficient use of their rights and properly highlights one of the reasons for the actual limitations imposed on such rights: "Managements of enterprises under republic and union jurisdiction virtually dictate to the local soviets how to solve sociocultural problems, frequently on the basis of their narrow departmental interests." The author believes that party principle-mindedness can be the only antidote to this "departmental dictatorship." "Only one person must head the rayon, city, oblast, kray or republic: the chairman of the respective soviet, who must also be the first secretary of the respective party committee."

This view, as the editorial mail indicates, is quite popular because of the unsolved nature of many problems of economic management. All too frequently the party authorities have assumed extraneous functions and weakened their attention to political problems, as the January Central Committee Plenum emphasized. This error, however, also indicates that the people have a great and sincere faith in the party.

The journal's mail confirms vividly and in a variety of ways the important stipulation expressed in the report submitted at the plenum: "Society is particularly sensitive to anything related to the moral aspect of party members, managers above all. Our most important task is to restore the pure and honest appearance of the manager-communist, an image which has been somewhat tarnished by the crimes committed by many degenerates."

"I am not a party member but am greatly concerned for the destinies of our country," begins her letter to the editors geophysicist Volkova from the Komi ASSR. She is concerned mostly with the selection and placement of leading party cadres. She believes that promotions to such positions must mandatorily be made with the participation of the primary party organizations in which the candidate managers are well-known and where not only the practical but also the moral, the "personality qualities" are taken into consideration, and where managers must meet stricter criteria than would ordinary party members. Volkova refers us to newspaper and journal materials which do not depict the image of the party member in the best of lights. "Many such materials have been published of late!" she writes. "In frequent cases the culprits have been leading party workers! The harm they cause to our society, to our system should be viewed as treason! Yes, precisely treason! In this case there should be neither forgiveness nor tolerance. Our party must be cleansed."

Identical or very similar thoughts are found in a number of letters. I chose this one precisely because, better than others, through its style and intonation it brings to light the profound personal concern for the future of one's country, the hurt caused by common failures, concern caused by unsolved problems and a rarely spiritual view on grave problems. The geophysicist from the Komi ASSR describes how personally her colleagues were affected by the

events in Alma-Ata and discusses the national problem in simple, ordinary terms. All republics must equally share the good and the bad. Russia is the oldest sister in a large family and is the one most concerned with the proper raising and education of her younger sisters. Could one forget good achievements? "I am Bashkir by nationality," Volkova goes on to say. "I well remember my aunties, afflicted with trachoma, who did not know the meaning of bathing. Today children are scientists."

She writes about G.V. Kolbin, Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, as of someone she knows well: "How good it is that the republic's party organization is headed by a practical person. He must be helped by the cadres, albeit only at first. Naturally, Comrade Kolbin will not find his work simple. Nonetheless, I believe that he will succeed."

This letter is very sincere, principle-minded and good. It shows a sober, close and touchingly simple view of a nonparty person about party work and the people who head such work. This is not a detached view. I would say that it indicates a personal involvement. This is precisely the case. In the final account, the state of affairs in a ruling party is of most profound interest to any honest citizen, particularly when it becomes a question of errors or gross violations. However, what concerns the author is something else: How to find, how not to ignore a talented person. "Such people are our greatest national resource. We must handle it quite carefully. It is terribly damaging when such people are not allowed to develop."

The honesty, principle-mindedness and dedication of the party leader are today a matter of most vital political significance. This is the view taken by many readers. "The tremendous efforts which our ideological opponents are making to discredit the Communist Party pale compared with the destructive force of the dishonesty of some party leaders. An appeal to honesty in the mouth of a dishonest person is devastating to our party. Nothing worse could exist in our fatherland than a communist without honor. The promotion of such a person is an extremely dangerous phenomenon, for it entails other similar phenomena," writes physician M. Abdulkhabirov (Moscow). Like other journal readers, he clearly enumerates the qualities which a party leader must have: competence, moral purity, modesty, impeccable honesty, energetic practicality, deep knowledge of life, high standards, the ability to understand and hear out a person, an uncompromising character and bolshevik convictions....

In my count the readers list more than 30 practical qualities and character features which, in their shared view, a party worker must have. The author of one of the letters has even drafted a "manager's code" (applicable not only to the party) in which, in the section discussing relations with subordinates, he suggests the following: "One should not limit contacts to one's family and celebrate holidays in a small circle of friends" (I. Kopelev, Lipetsk). In my view, the modesty of a party member must have its limits. The high exigency displayed toward a party member, and even more so toward a manager, is understandable and necessary. However, reading such letters makes a raykom or obkom secretary look as nothing but a perfectly assembled robot.

The close attention paid to one character trait--modesty--is no accident. It is backed by something greater than highlighting some psychological or moral

fine points in the behavior of a party manager. The readers do not reduce everything to a feeling of indignation triggered by the use of official position for selfish purposes or to negative phenomena of the same kind. Here everything is clear and understandable. They directly relate the category of party modesty to the basic tasks of restructuring. A high official who yields to flattery, who shows arrogance and egotism, could cause society material and moral harm in his position, sometimes worse than the harm caused by a simple bribe-taker or black marketeer. Intoxication with one's own greatness creates a corresponding psychological atmosphere surrounding such a leader. People begin to judge him not for his real accomplishments but for the distinctions he has been awarded, which are sometimes undeserved, for "begged and connived prizes and rewards," and by whether or not someone was able to get himself "awarded an order" in the recent past, writes B. Uspenskiy. Perhaps the reason for which the value of governmental awards has depreciated so precipitously in the country is that more than anyone else undeserved (but order-bearing!) individuals are the proudest boasters of such awards. Let there be less praise of managers! The reward of an honest and intelligent leader is the success of the cause which he serves and the collective he heads, and the respect of his subordinates for his competence and a feeling of justice. "Let the names of such people be in the hearts and not the mouths of others" (M. Abdulkhabirov). The category of party modesty is considered not only as applicable to individual managers. "One thing I cannot understand," the author of this letter goes on to say, "is the fact that grandiose buildings of raykoms, gorkoms, obkoms and central committees stand side by side with obsolete buildings of kindergartens, schools and hospitals, and the tremendous disparity in social benefits based on one's position."

The readers have actively joined in the debate on cadre policy. They comment on the plenum's materials, discuss this journal's publications on this problem, develop the thoughts of authors of articles, and expand and refine them. Sometimes they disagree and argue, which is quite natural with such debates. For example, P. Burak, docent, CPSU history department, Lvov University, considers unconvincing the claim of I. Polozkov, first secretary, CPSU Krasnodar Kraykom (KOMMUNIST, No 17, 1986, p 36) to the effect that the horizontal transfer of cadres has proved to be exceptionally effective. "As a rule," the author of the letter notes, "such practices cause local dissatisfaction. Years pass before a new manager can become accustomed to his new position. Practical experience indicates that local workers who have spent 10 to 15 years on the job become "burned out" and are incapable of creative work even under different circumstances. Unless they have displayed the necessary talent for promotion to more responsible party positions, they should be transferred to economic work. We should also remember that horizontal transfers lead many capable local workers to lose perspective."

B. Khorev, Moscow University professor, makes clear his views on cadre policy. He writes, among others, that "Basic science is found in the capitals of union republics, in Moscow and Leningrad. Here we also find the backbone of management and the best cadres. Naturally, the key to cadre problems is also here. However, we should not ignore the outlying areas. There is no cadre scarcity in the capital cities. On the contrary, here their potential is tremendous although, it is true, from time to time, it is replenished by borrowing from other parts of the country."

"However, the outlying areas are not a bottomless barrel" (he goes on to list dozens of VUZs without professors, or academic institutes in peripheral areas where key positions remain vacant, and so on--author). Cadre migration follows the strict itinerary of rayon-oblast-capital city. Naturally, the worst situation prevails on the rayon level; it is equally bad in the farms which supply personnel on this level. The fact that the RAPO recruits specialists from the countryside is quite alarming....

"When, finally, will there be a centrifugal move in our country or, even better, an equally strong centripetal trend? In my view, all the necessary objective prerequisites now exist for a normal, natural and free exchange of cadres between the center and the periphery, an exchange which has been disturbed for quite some time. As in the past, however, this is hindered by bureaucratic hurdles erected God knows when."

"No one will voluntarily leave a big city, fearing to lose his residency permit. The suggestion of 'guaranteed return' for those who go to work elsewhere and their transfer was suggested 15 years ago."

Suggestions relative to perfecting cadre policy within the party itself include ideas such as "Age limits must be set for managers of all ranks." Or else ideas which, to say the least, are controversial, such as "Let us not nominate candidates for elections in primary party organizations and instead of ballots distribute membership lists. Let everyone be a candidate. This would be more democratic."

One of the many features the readers believe a modern party worker should have is almost as popular as modesty. The manager must be a creative, an unusual person. "The party needs choir leaders and not sing-along people. To be a choir leader, however, one must have a good voice!" (V. Uvarov, Kiev). Actually, this does not apply to managers only.

I repeat, it was not the purpose of this survey to mirror the editorial mail received since the beginning of the year. These are merely lines of the portrait of the KOMMUNIST readership. Such lines may be random or vague, merely indicating the outlines of the complex, original and conflicting image. Let this image become more concise and clearer. Perhaps the reader would like to find out what those who make this journal think about him. It is precisely thus that reciprocal understanding develops, without which a publication could hardly expect any feedback.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

PRICELESS LINES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 123-124

[Review by V. Mosolov of the book "Unbekanntes von Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx" [Unfamiliar Texts by Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx]. Part 1: 1840-1874. Preface by Bert Andreas, Jacques Grandjans and Hans Pelger. Trier, 1986, 238 pp]

[Text] Attention to anything related to the life and activities of the founders of Marxism and the dissemination of their doctrine is growing with every passing year.

Each new find in the legacy of Marx and Engels, whether an article, letter, note or summary, is of the greatest interest: how does it enrich the great doctrine, and what can it contribute to understanding and solving the problems which face mankind today?

The publication of the complete collected works of K. Marx and F. Engels (MEGA), undertaken by the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and the institute of Marxism-Leninism of the SED Central Committee, undertaken by decision of the Central Committees of the CPSU and the SED, provides a powerful international impetus in Marxist research, the systematic search for new works by Marx and Engels, the development of problems of the establishment and development of Marxist theory and the intensified study of processes of the dissemination of Marxism and its unification with the proletarian movement.

Such work is taking place in the course of steady contacts with scientific institutions and scientists throughout the world, including Karl Marx House in Trier (FRG). This is a scientific research institute and museum, closely related to the Social Democratic Party of Germany, which is fruitfully cooperating with Soviet institutes and scientists engaged in the study of the life and activities of Marx and Engels. The series "Works of Karl Marx House" includes the collection under review. It was compiled by the following known researchers: Bert Andreas (Switzerland), who recently passed away, Jacques Grandjans (France) and Hans Pelger (FRG), director of Karl Marx House. The documents it contains, as the preface emphasizes, were found in the course of long years of international studies on the history of socialism, which

"acquired a new dimension, particularly in connection with work on the publication of the MEGA" (p 11).

Let us immediately stipulate, as noted in the preface, that the definition "unknown," as applied to this collection, does not necessarily mean "first publication." Included in the book are texts which indeed meet this definition and works previously published in different countries but in rare editions as well as, finally, works which so far have not been published in the original language. Let us also mention that a number of most interesting and significant texts in the collection were published for the first time in the second edition of the works of Marx and Engels in Russian (particularly in the last, 50th, volume). This fact is one more confirmation of the long and successful work done in our country in accordance with Lenin's behest on assembling, publishing and studying the ideological legacy of the founders of scientific communism.

The collection includes various materials, such as letters and articles by Marx and Engels, newspaper reports on their speeches, documents related to their life and activities, dedications in books presented to them, etc. The documents are accompanied by extensive comments which provide valuable information and are largely based on archives and major scientific research projects and, unquestionably, will be of interest to researchers in their own right. For example, the letter sent to Marx by W. Riley, editor of the newspaper INTERNATIONAL HERALD, includes a list of works written by Marx and Engels or edited by them and printed in that newspaper (see pp 173-177). The collection includes a bibliographic index and an index of names and periodicals.

In frequent cases each individual document is another small additional feature added to the general picture of the life and struggle of Marx and Engels.

Thus, a number of materials included in the collection will help the reader to intensify his ideas on the development of Marx's economic theory, the dissemination of "Das Kapital" and the promotion of its ideas. The letters to A. Klussa, member of the Communist League, who emigrated to the United States, dated 5 and 18 October 1853, indicate that at that time Marx had developed the theory of the land rental. "Land fertility....," he wrote, "is something very relative. As the science of chemistry develops and as its application in agronomy changes, so does land fertility and its level in terms of society. This is the only type of fertility of interest to us" (p 44). In criticizing the claim made by American petit bourgeois economist H. Carry on the harmony of class interests in capitalist society, Marx emphasized that "It is excessively naive to presume that if the overall labor product grows the third class which should divide it among itself divides this increase equally. If profits increase by 20 percent the workers are forced to strike to get a 2 percent wage increase" (p 46). Other materials deal with the dissemination of "Das Kapital." This is, first of all, a relatively new type of text introduced in scientific circulation: Marx's dedications written on copies of the first German edition of the work which he presented to his friends and supporters (see pp 95-99, 106).

Another item of considerable interest is the list of individuals to whom Marx sent copies of the French translation of the first volume of "Das Kapital." This list shows that in a period of roughly 3 years he sent copies to more than 50 people in nine different countries in Europe and North America. They included friends and fellow-workers of the founder of scientific communism, labor movement leaders and men of science and culture, including four of our compatriots: M.F. Danyelson, P.L. Lavrov, G.A. Lopatin and M.M. Kovalevskiy (see p 157).

The documents included in the collection also shed light on some aspects of the activities of the great philosophers in the international labor movement, particularly the contacts which Marx maintained in the 1840s with worker organizations in Paris (see pp 18, 40) or Engels' cooperation with the labor press. This includes one of his articles, not included in his Works, published in the French journal L'ATELIER, in which he describes the significance of the Chartist movement (see pp 33-35).

The activities of the founders of Marxism in the First International are also reflected in a number of documents in the collection. They emphasize the importance of international proletarian solidarity and the unification and organization of the proletariat as "the only possible means of eliminating bourgeois exploitation" (p 129); it indicates the way aid to emigres of the Commune was organized and exposes the bourgeois slander of the communards; it discusses the struggle against reformism and Bakuninism in the International Association of Workers.

Marx's speech delivered at the 13 August 1867 meeting of the General Council of the First International on the attitude toward the congress of the Peace and Freedom League, published in its French translation, sounds amazingly topical. Printed in the newspaper COURRIER FRANCAIS, it is one of the proofs of Marx's attitude toward problems of war and peace. It was precisely in that speech that he formulated the idea that, in the final account, the unification of the working class of different countries should make wars among nations impossible (see p 81).

The historical merit of the First International was that it created conditions for the extensive dissemination of Marxist ideas in the labor movement. In a letter to T. Alsop, dated 23 December 1873, included in the collection, in discussing Marxist economic theory, Marx noted with satisfaction that "...My views are beginning to become popular among workers on the continent and...the upper classes and official representatives of political economy on that continent, who are quite displeased, are making a lot of noise on this subject" (pp 183-184). In that same letter he drew attention to the aggravation of social contradictions in Russia, where "Elements of a general upheaval are accumulating," and to the international importance of this process (see p 184).

Another merit of the collection is that it enables us to identify the bibliography used by Marx. Unquestionably, this will be of great help establishing the nature of his private library, which is a project of the MEGA.

All in all, let us note that this book proves once again the effectiveness of purposeful research and publication on an international scale of the theoretical legacy of the founders of Marxism and the documents related to their lives and activities. It is also a vivid confirmation of the fruitfulness of cooperation among researchers with different political and ideological beliefs, including communists and social democrats, in the study of Marxism, which is one of the greatest achievements of human thought.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

SHORT BOOK REVIEWS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 124-125

[Text] "Imperializm. Religiya. Tserkov" [Imperialism. Religion. The Church]. By N.A. Kovalskiy. Reviewed by S. Zemlyanoy, candidate of philological sciences.

At one point, in a speech to heads of religious radio broadcasting stations in the United States, the leader of the current administration in Washington sympathetically quoted the words of one of the religious extreme conservatives or, as they are known occasionally in that country, "political fundamentalists:" "I would rather my two daughters, whom I love more than anything else in the world, die today with faith in God than grow up under communism." The entire content of N. Kovalskiy's book, in which this statement is quoted (see p 51) proves that such declarations are not merely excesses of anticommunism.

A particularly obvious aspiration to shift into a political context many of the elements of religious views on the world and categories of religious morality may be traced in the United States. Also noteworthy is the study of the activities of right-wing organizations with a religious coloring, such as the "Moral Majority," the extremist "Posse Comitatus," the "Christian Defense League," and others. Some of the new aspects characteristic of the 1980s include studies of a trend toward the internationalization of clerical forces and their creation of international associations and organizations with the participation of other conservative political movements.

Descriptions of the integration of the church within the system of state-monopoly capitalism are of great interest. Such information, which is relatively unknown in our social science studies and propaganda, lifts the curtain of perhaps the greatest "church sacrament:" the amount, structure and individual items of its income. The Vatican, the scientist writes, has become a concern which invests funds in all major banks in the capitalist world and owns stock in multinational monopolies, American, West German and Canadian in particular. The property of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, for example, is estimated at \$21 billion (see p 157). Therefore, the alliance between international capital and some clerical circles determines quite strictly the anticommunist position held by the latter.

The author discusses extensively the basic areas of propaganda cover of Washington's program of expansion and global domination. This program is largely based on the postulates of religious-political "fundamentalism," which considers all international problems on the level of the struggle between "God" and "Satan," "evil" versus "virtue," and "sin" versus "righteousness."

However primitive such arguments may be, according to which anything done by the United States in the international arena is considered moral, they are shared today by many U.S. state personalities. The idea that America is "God's favorite daughter" greatly contributes to a blindness to the new realities of the world on the part of its supporters. Specific materials cited in the book indicate yet another unseemly aspect of involving religious postulates in foreign policy: ascribing a "messianic" spirit to the aggressive and inhuman postulates of "neoglobalism."

Furthermore, the study proves, in a concise yet convincing fashion, the growing counteraction on the part of a significant percentage of religious forces to imperialist policy and the reasons for this noteworthy phenomenon. Antiwar feelings and an understanding of the need for a new, a realistic approach to the solution of global problems is spreading among believers and is reflected in specific speeches and actions.

The leaders of many religious organizations, the author emphasizes, cannot ignore such moods. It was no accident that the national conference of Catholic bishops in the United States challenged the administration in Washington by including in its pastoral message "On War and Peace" demands of an antiwar nature, which clash with the aggressive course charted by the White House. Such cases, as the material provided by the scientist indicate, are becoming increasingly frequent. This increases the real possibilities of expanding and strengthening the alliance between the revolutionary labor movement and the believing masses, on the basis of an antiwar, anti-imperialist and antimonopoly foundation. It is precisely from this that the communists proceed in developing their dialogue with believers on vital problems which affect every person today.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 125-126

[Text] 1. "V.I. Lenin o Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii" [V.I. Lenin on the Socialist Revolution]. In 2 volumes. Vol 1, 1899-1917. Vol 2, 1917-1923. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987. Vol 1, 351 pp; Vol 2, 366 pp.

2. "Lenin. Partiya. Molodezh" [Lenin. Party. Youth]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 446 pp.

3. "Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Sovetskogo Soyuz v Rezolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh Syezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov TsK (1898-1986)" [The Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums (1898-1986)]. Ninth supplemented and corrected edition. Vol 13, 1976-1980. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 510 pp.

4. "KPSS o Sredstvakh Massovoy Informatsii i Propagandy" [The CPSU on Mass Information and Propaganda Media]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 608 pp.

5. Gorbachev, M.S. "Molodezh—Tvorcheskaya Sila Revolyutsionnogo Obnovleniya" [Youth—A Creative Force in Revolutionary Renovation]. Address delivered at the 20th Komsomol Congress, 16 April 1987. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 32 pp.

6. "Ateisticheskiye Chteniya. Vypusk 16" [Atheistic Readings. Issue No 16]. Compiled and edited by T.I. Trifonova. Politizdat, Moscow, 1986, 111 pp with illustrations.

7. Grimak, L.P. "Reservy Chelovecheskoy Psikhiki" [Reserves of the Human Mind]. Introduction to the psychology of activeness. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 286 pp.

8. Kim Il Sen "Izbrannyye Proizvedeniya" [Selected Works]. Translated from the Korean. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 184 pp.

9. "XI Syezd Sotsialisticheskoy Yedinoy Partii Germanii" [11th Congress of

the Socialist Unity Party of Germany]. Berlin, 17-21 April 1986. Translated from the German. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 280 pp.

10. O'Riordan, M. "Kolonna Konnoli. Rasskaz ob Irlandtsakh, Srazhavshikhsya v Ryadakh Internatsionalnykh Brigad v Natsionalno-Revolyutsionnoy Voiny Ispanskogo Naroda. 1936-1939 Gg" [The Connolly Column. Story of the Irishmen Who Fought in the International Brigades in the National Revolutionary War of the Spanish People, 1936-1939]. Translated from the English. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 255 pp with illustrations.

11. Selunskaya, V.M. "Sotsialnaya Struktura Sovetskogo Obshchestva" [The Social Structure of Soviet Society]. History and contemporaneity. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 288 pp.

12. Smirnov, K. "Faust Protiv Mefistofeli?" [Faustus Versus Mephistopheles?]. Dialogues and thoughts on the moral problems of scientific and technical progress. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 287 pp.

13. "Stakhanovtsy Vosmidesyatykh" [Stakhanovites of the 1980s]. (On the continuation and development of Stakhanovite traditions). Compiled by N.D. Layporov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 255 pp with illustrations.

14. "Filosofiya Gegelya: Problemy Dialektiki" [Hegel's Philosophy: Problems of Dialectics]. Responsible editors: T.I. Oyzerman and N.V. Motroshilova. Nauka, Moscow, 1987, 304 pp.

15. "Filosofiya i Kultura" [Philosophy and Culture]. 17th World Philosophy Congress: Problems, Discussions, Views. V.V. Mshveniyeradze, responsible editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1987, 335 pp.

16. Scharf, E. "Izbrannyye Stati i Rechi (1948-1985 Gody)" [Selected Articles and Speeches (1948-1985)]. Translated from the German. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 263 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

Little attention is being paid to problems of intensification of intraparty democracy and development of socialist self-government by the people.

The journal frequently avoids principle-minded criticism of shortcomings. It poorly exposes negative phenomena in some areas of life in the republic. It rarely publishes problem articles. It does not promote debates and discussions on new, controversial and unsolved problems, which prevents the fullest possible determination of the entire range of opinions and views, comparisons among different positions and viewpoints and a collective search for sensible alternate solutions to crucial problems.

The decree emphasizes that it is not normal for no more than 1 out of 5 articles to consider specific topical problems of political, socioeconomic and cultural life in the republic and that there are virtually no extensive works on important problems, such as perfecting the activities of the agroindustrial complex, applying progressive labor organization and wage methods and renovating sociocultural life in the countryside. The level of book criticism and bibliography remains low. Frequently reviews are of a complimentary nature. Proper attention to problems of the theory and practice of Soviet party press is lacking.

It is pointed out that the journal does not actively contribute to the profound restructuring of the entire system of social sciences in the republic and that its influence on scientific institutions is weak. The editors have been unable to activate to its fullest extent the potential of the republic's scientific thinking and rely on a relatively small circle of contributors. They rarely use democratic forms of journal activities, such as roundtable talks, and articles by frontranking workers and kolkhoz members; surveys of editorial mail are not published.

The decree notes that such serious shortcomings and omissions are the result of inefficient involvement in the work and insufficient self-critical evaluation of the state of affairs by the editors and the low activeness of the journal's editorial collegium.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee considers the work of the editorial collegium, the party organization and the editorial collective of SAKARTVELOS KOMUNISTI in restructuring in the light of the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Journal KOMMUNIST" insufficient.

The Central Committee has made it incumbent upon the editorial collegium, the party organization and the creative editorial collective to base their activities on the requirements of the 27th CPSU Congress, the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the tasks formulated in the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Journal KOMMUNIST" and the speeches by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, at the all-union conference of heads of departments of social sciences, and his February meeting with heads of mass information and propaganda media at the CPSU Central Committee.

IN THE COURSE OF RESTRUCTURING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) pp 126-128

[Text] The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee heard a report submitted by the journal SAKARTVELOS KOMUNISTI ("Georgian Communist") on restructuring the work of the editors in the light of the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Journal KOMMUNIST" (1986).

The decree passed by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, which is published in SAKARTVELOS KOMUNISTI (No 3, 1987), notes that the editors have done some work on restructuring their activities. The journal is covering more extensively problems of socialist theory and practice. Greater attention is being paid to the study and summation of experience in party, soviet, economic and cultural building.

Nonetheless, the decree emphasizes, the journal has still not become the authoritative rostrum for sociopolitical thinking in the republic. It does not contribute with sufficient efficiency to the implementation of the innovative ideas of the 27th CPSU Congress, the development in cadres and leading workers of the skill of thinking and acting under the new conditions in the spirit of party contemporary requirements, and the development and assertion of everything progressive which is born in the course of restructuring and the interpretation of its profoundly revolutionary nature.

The journal lacks sufficient daring, and initiative-mindedness in formulating new questions and in seeking ways and means of solving urgent problems. It does not fully reflect topical theoretical problems of socialist renovation. It fails to pay proper attention to the study of the reasons which hinder the restructuring of social life and to indicating contradictions at a time marked by efforts to eliminate obsolete social mechanisms and to sum up processes occurring in the society.

Problems of perfecting party construction, cadre and ideological work and restructuring of the activities of the party itself and the local party committees and primary organizations, are still insufficiently discussed.

It is deemed expedient to broaden the regular exchange of materials with editors of theoretical and political organs of the central committees of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Communist Parties--the journals KOMMUNIST AZERBAYDZHANA and PO LENINSKOMU PUTI.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee propaganda and agitation, organizational party work, science and educational institutions and economics departments must help the journal's editors in radically restructuring the journal's work in the light of the party's current requirements.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

The decree emphasizes that the journal must increase the efficiency of its materials under conditions of greater democracy. It must make the content and ways and means of its work consistent with the requirements of the time and provide a sober analysis of the facts. Attention must be focused on describing the features of the current transitional stage in the life of Soviet society and the ever-growing role of the party as its leading and guiding force.

The activities of the CPSU, as the vanguard of the Soviet people, which is steadily improving the ways and means of its work and strengthening its ties with the masses must be described extensively, with specific examples; it must comprehensively promote the party's course of intensified Soviet democracy, development of the people's socialist self-government and enhancement of the well-being of the working people. It is very important comprehensively to interpret the party's social policy and the enhancement of new approaches in the social area and the nature of the principle of social justice.

Tireless attention must be paid to the activities of party organizations in promoting the international and patriotic upbringing of the working people, strengthening fraternal friendship among peoples and developing an intolerant attitude toward any manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism and national exclusivity. The materials must sum up the experience acquired by the party organizations in surmounting in the minds and behavior of the people a private-ownership mentality, negative phenomena, money grubbing, bribery, bureaucratism, etc.

The journal must comprehensively increase openness. It must regularly sponsor discussions with the participation of theoretical scientists, teachers and practical workers who must contribute their experience, and knowledge of the work and of the real needs and necessities. While promoting creative discussions, it is necessary to raise controversial problems and bring to light the variety of approaches to their solution and contribute to the formulation of the most efficient ways and means of solving them in the course of the discussions.

On the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the journal must prepare a series of articles reflecting the comprehensive experience of our party and people and the interconnection between the ideals of the October Revolution and the present party course. It must focus attention on the problems to be solved.

The journal must recruit as contributors the best theoretical forces. It must publish more frequently new authors, including nonparty members and strengthen the ties between editors and party, scientific and other establishments. It is important to hold regularly joint practical science conferences and seminars and to formulate serious recommendations of a theoretical and practical nature, avoiding petty topics, scholasticism and pseudoscience. Scientific works and books must be reviewed and annotated more competently, on the basis of the criteria of objectivity and exigency; petty tastes and subjectivistic bias, praise and compliments must be deleted, and greater attention must be paid to surveys of republic newspapers and journals.

CHRONICLE: MEETINGS WITH THE EDITORS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 7, May 87 (signed to press 20 Apr 87) p 128

[Text] A meeting between editors of republic party journals, who participated in the conference of social scientists, sponsored by the USSR Academy of Sciences, was held in the premises of KOMMUNIST on 18 April.

A practical exchange of views took place on how better to organize the implementation of the results of the conference in party journals, in the spirit of the requirements presented in the report submitted by A.N. Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo Candidate Member, CPSU Central Committee Secretary and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member.

The editors were visited by a delegation of the British Communist Party, headed by I. McKey, member of the political committee of the party's executive committee, visiting the USSR on the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. The guests were interested in problems related to restructuring taking place in our country and the role of the press in the development of democratization, openness, criticism and self-criticism.

KOMMUNIST was visited by delegations from the Society of Friends of the Soviet Union and the Indian-Soviet Cultural Society, who are visiting the USSR on the invitation of the SSOD and the Society of Soviet-Indian Friendship, for the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two countries. The Indian guests showed great interest in the practical implementation of the program of democratization of our society and the development of Soviet culture, science and art under the new conditions, and the role of young people in restructuring. Members of the editorial board answered questions on the journal's work on implementing the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

A meeting between KOMMUNIST editors and scientists from the international scientific research center was held at the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research (Dubna, Moscow Oblast). An active discussion was held on the theory and practice of restructuring, the development of democracy in Soviet society, the broadening of openness and the development of criticism and self-criticism in the light of the decisions of the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Problems of the important role of science in the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and the responsibility of scientists

engaged in research in the priority areas of scientific and technical progress were debated. The editors spoke of the journal's creative plans.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

5003

CSO: 1802/13

END

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

17 Sept 1987